



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SO-CALLED 'LEPROSY' LAWS

AN ANALYSIS OF LEVITICUS, CHAPTERS 13 AND 14

BY MORRIS JASTROW, jun., University of Pennsylvania.

I

THE composite character of the two chapters—Leviticus 13 and 14—comprising the laws and regulations for the diagnosis and treatment of various skin diseases, and of suspicious spots appearing in garments and houses, together with the purification rites, has long been recognized.¹ Indeed, the mere enumeration of the variety of subjects treated of in these two chapters, which form a little code by themselves, furnishes a presumption in favour of the view that the chapters represent a gradual growth. A closer study of the two chapters not only confirms this presumption, but also shows that the growth betrays an even more complicated process than is the case in other little groups of laws and regulations, such as Lev. 1-5. We not only find that the two chapters may be subdivided into numerous smaller sections, each representing a supplement added to the basic stock of the little code, but that within these sections, glosses, comments, and illustrations are introduced which point to a treatment of the older Hebrew codes, not unlike that accorded to the later Code of

¹ See especially Baentsch's remarks on p. 364 of his *Kommentar zu den Büchern Exodus und Leviticus*

Judaism, known as the Mishnah, and which by the addition of a steadily-growing commentary and continuous elaboration, known as the Gemara, grew into the Talmud. In other words, we can distinguish in Leviticus 13 and 14 (as in other groups within the Priestly Code) elements which correspond to the division between Mishnah and Gemara in the great compilation of Rabbinical Judaism, and we can also trace in the growth of the two chapters the same process which produced the Gemara as a superstructure to the Mishnah. The intrinsic importance of the two chapters, and the frequency with which they have been treated because of their medical interest,² justify the endeavour to carry the analysis by a renewed study somewhat further than has yet been done, particularly as this analysis is a *conditio sine qua non* for an understanding of the medical aspects of the chapters. While it is not my purpose to discuss in detail these medical aspects, I shall touch upon them at the close of this article, chiefly with a view of showing the manner in which they should be considered, and also to furnish the reasons for the conviction that I have gained that physicians who have occupied themselves with these two chapters have approached them from a wrong starting-point, and hence have reached conclusions which are correspondingly erroneous. To put it bluntly, before discussing the fundamental question whether *šāra'at* is 'leprosy' or not, one must settle which verses of the two chapters deal with *šāra'at*.

² See the literature in Baentsch's *Kommentar*, p. 364, and in Münch's *Die Zará'ath der Hebr. Bibel*, to which further additions may be made, such as Jay F. Schamberg's article on 'The Nature of the Leprosy of the Bible', *Phila. Polyclinic*, VII (1898), Nov. 19-26, or *Biblical World*, March, 1899, pp. 162-9. See further, note 144.

II

In a formal—not a documentary—analysis of the two chapters, we may distinguish—leaving aside headings and subscripts—the following:³

(1) 13. 2–46, diagnosis and treatment of various symptoms of pathological phenomena on the skin: (a) שְׂעִתָּה (*se'ēt*), (b) סַפְחַת (*sappahat*), (c) בַּהֲרַת (*baheret*), (d) שָׂרָא'אֵת (*šāra'at*), (e) שְׁחִין (*shehīn*), (f) מִקְוָה (*mikwah*), (g) נֶתֶק (*netek*), (h) בֹּהַק (*bōhaq*), (i) קֶרֶב'אֵה (*kērē'ah*), (k) גִּבְבֵּה'אֵה (*gibbē'ah*).

(2) 13. 47–59, *šāra'at* in garments.

(3) 14. 1–31, purification ritual at the time when the healing process of *šāra'at* on persons was complete.

(4) 14. 32–47, diagnosis and treatment of *šāra'at* appearing in houses.

(5) 14. 48–53, purification ritual for the case of *šāra'at* in houses.

It appears, then, that suspicious marks or spots—to use the vaguest and most indefinite kind of terms—may appear on persons, garments (in stuffs), and in houses, and that in connexion with each of these categories the diagnosis, treatment, and purification ritual are set forth. Throughout the two chapters, the term (*nega' šāra'at*) is constantly introduced, and by the side of this fuller term two abbreviated expressions *šāra'at* and *nega'*.⁴

³ In order to make the results of the investigation accessible to others than specialists in the Old Testament, I transliterate most of the Hebrew terms introduced.

⁴ *nega' šāra'at*, Lev. 13. 2, 3, 9, 20, 25, 27, 47, 49, 59; 14. 3, 34, 54; *nega'*, Lev. 13. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 17, 22, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54–58; 14. 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 43, 48; *šāra'at*, Lev. 13. 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 25, 30, 42, 43, 51, 52; 14. 7, 44, 55, 57. The synonymity of the three expressions is shown by the Greek text, which occasionally has *šāra'at*, e. g. 13. 20, where the Hebrew has *nega' šāra'at*, or adds *šāra'at*, e. g. 13. 29, where the Hebrew has merely *nega'*. The word *nega'* ('mark' or 'spot')

Taking up the first section, one is struck by the large number of medical terms introduced, supplementary to *ṣāra'at*. In connexion with each term *nega'* is used, which is thus shown to be a general term for any kind of a disease of the skin, indicated by a mark or marks. Clearly these supplementary terms represent attempts to differentiate between pathological phenomena which in an earlier, less scientific age were either grouped under *ṣāra'at* or under the general designation of 'marks' (*negā'im*). A closer inspection of the second verse of the thirteenth chapter furnishes the safe starting-point for a correct analysis. The verse reads as follows: 'If a man has on the skin of his flesh a swelling (*se'ēt*),⁵ growth (*sappaḥat*),⁶ or a bright spot (*baheret*),⁷ and it becomes on the skin of his flesh a *nega' ṣāra'at*, he is brought to Aaron the priest, or to one of his sons, the priests.' The name Aaron occurs in this verse only. Throughout the two chapters merely 'the priest' is used. We may, therefore, cut out 'Aaron' as well as the phrase 'or one of his sons the priests' as comments—corresponding to our foot-notes to explain what is meant by the term 'the priests'. In the second place, the repetition of 'on the skin of his flesh' is open to

has also the general force of a 'plague' or a 'disease', from the stem *nāga'* 'to strike down'. The etymology of *ṣāra'at* is somewhat obscure, though indications point likewise to the meaning 'strike' for the underlying stem which would make *ṣāra'at* a general term like *nega'*, and not a specific designation.

⁵ *se'ēt* from *nāsa'*, 'to raise', clearly indicates a rising on the skin, i. e. a swelling of some kind.

⁶ *sappaḥat*, of which *mispaḥat* (vers. 6, 7, 8) is a synonym, from *sāpaḥ* 'to add, supplement', refers to something added to the skin, i. e. a growth.

⁷ *baheret*, from *bāhar*, 'to shine', is an inflamed bit of skin, i. e. a shining spot (to use an indefinite term), intended to describe the prominent feature of an inflammation.

suspicion, which is reinforced by the awkward construction *l'negā' šāra'at*, i. e. 'to a *negā' šāra'at*'. A glance at the various commentators will show us the difficulties involved in getting a satisfactory meaning.⁸ If now we remove the three terms 'swelling', 'growth', and 'bright spot', and assume that the verse in its original form spoke of the *šāra'at* only, the construction becomes perfectly simple, to wit: 'If a man has on the skin of his flesh a *šāra'at* mark (i. e. *negā' šāra'at*), and he is brought to the priest.' The proof of the correctness of this view is furnished by the third verse, which reads: 'And the priest sees the mark (*negā'*) on the skin of his flesh, and the hair at the mark has turned white, and the mark (*negā'*) appears deeper than the skin of his flesh, then it *is* a *šāra'at* mark, and⁹ he shall declare him unclean.' Here, then, we have the beginning of the chapter in its original form—a diagnosis of what constitutes *šāra'at*, and a simple means of determining whether a man has *šāra'at* or not. It is just the kind of diagnosis that we may expect in an age in which medical knowledge is based on observation merely.

With these two verses as a starting-point, we can proceed without much difficulty to pick out other verses which belong to the older stratum of the chapter. Verses 9-13

⁸ To translate as Strack, Baentsch, and others, 'and it develops in the skin of his flesh to a *negā' šāra'at*', meets with a fatal objection through the circumstance that it is a *negā' šāra'at* *only* after the priest has pronounced it as such, as indicated in ver. 3.

⁹ The text adds, 'and the priest shall see it', which is superfluous, since the words 'and the priest sees' stand at the beginning of the verse. Either the repetition is the addition of some pedantic scribe who wanted to make it perfectly clear that the words 'he shall declare him unclean' refer to the priest's declaration, or it is a gloss that has slipped into the wrong place.

furnish further details regarding the *ṣāra'at*. They read, exclusive of glosses and comments, as follows:

'If there is a *ṣāra'at* mark on a man, and he is brought to the priest; and the priest sees that there is a white swelling (*se'ēt*) on the skin that has turned the hair white,¹⁰ it is a chronic¹¹ *ṣāra'at* in the skin of his flesh, and the priest shall declare him unclean.¹² But if the *ṣāra'at* steadily spreads in the skin until the *ṣāra'at* covers the entire skin,¹³ and the priest sees that the *ṣāra'at* covers the entire flesh,¹⁴ [then the priest] shall declare the mark clean.'¹⁵

¹⁰ The text adds, anticipating the diagnosis in the next section (14-17), 'and there is raw flesh (*bāsār hay*) in the swelling'. As a synonym to *bāsār hay*, another version or a commentator used the term (מִלְחָה *milyah*) 'a raw spot'. A later scribe embodied the synonym in the text which thus became redundant.

¹¹ נוֹשֶׁנֶת (*nošenet*), literally 'of old standing', which I believe conveys the idea that we attach to 'chronic'. The ordinary rendering 'recurrent' misses the *nuance* and is without warrant.

¹² Additions (1) 'without shutting him in', harking back to the 'shutting in' as a test in the case of *baheret* (vers. 4-5); (2) 'for he is unclean', כִּי טָמֵא הוּא, a second comment to explain why he is not shut in. These brief comments are just in the style of the Gemara. If amplified, vers. 10-11 could easily be put in the form of a Mishnah and a Gemara, as follows: The law is that if the priest sees that a white swelling on the skin has turned the hair white, it is a chronic *ṣāra'at*. Now since in the case of a 'white shining spot' it is said (Lev. 13. 4) that the victim is shut in for seven days, you might suppose that in the case of a 'white swelling' this should also be done. It is not required. Why not? Because a 'white swelling' of itself makes him unclean.

¹³ Two comments are added: (1) namely, 'the mark (extends) from his head to his feet'; (2) 'according to the complete inspection of the priest', i. e. it is only upon the inspection of the priest, not upon the report of the victim or of any other person, that the diagnosis of the whole body being covered with the *negā'* can be established.

¹⁴ Instead of 'all his flesh' (כָּל בָּשָׂרוֹ) the Greek version has 'all his skin'.

¹⁵ Two glosses: (1) 'all turned white' to the word 'flesh'; (2) 'he is clean',—the final decision. This decision, 'he is clean' or 'he is unclean',

It is clear that we have here (vers. 9-11) a second diagnosis involving, just as the first, the determination of the question whether the suspicious mark is a genuine *ṣāra'at* or not; and since in the original form of the diagnosis the decisive indication is, as in the first diagnosis, the change of colour in the hair to white, the two cases would be identical but for the addition in the second case of the symptom of a 'white swelling'. This 'white swelling', it would seem, is the basis for the decision that it is a case of 'chronic *ṣāra'at*', as against a simple form of *ṣāra'at* in the first diagnosis, where we have the contrast to the 'swelling' on the mark expressed as 'deeper than the skin', i.e. high-relief in one case and bas-relief in the other. Placing the two decisions side by side, we can follow the process which gradually led to the present complicated form of the two chapters. The introduction of the 'swelling' as a new factor¹⁶ suggested a consideration of further symptoms appearing in the skin, and accordingly the first diagnosis or decision was amplified (ver. 2) by the addition of (a) a *sappahat* (ספח), i.e. 'growth'; (b) *baheret*, i.e. 'bright spot'; and this naturally leads in turn (vers. 4, 5) to a diagnosis of *baheret* and (vers. 6-8) of what constitutes a *mispahat*, involving in both cases the determination *after* a test or after a double test whether it may develop into a genuine *ṣāra'at* or is a harmless manifestation.

To the second decision, however, there is also added (vers. 12, 13) a diagnosis of a case in which the mark

is frequently added in Lev. 13, and apparently as a quick means for reference on the part of the priests, who would naturally consult the legal compilations when cases were brought before them.

¹⁶ The 'swelling' (*se'et*) in ver. 2 thus appears only upon the second diagnosis.

suspected of being *ṣāra'at* turns out to be harmless or, to use the technical language of the decision, 'it is clean'. The diagnosis rests manifestly again upon pure empiricism: that a mark spreading over the entire body is an innocent rash, or at all events 'clean'.

We thus have as a part of the original form of the *ṣāra'at* Torah three decisions: (a) 'unclean', i.e. genuine *ṣāra'at*, in case the hair at the mark turns white and the mark is deeper than the skin; (b) 'unclean' and 'chronic', in case the hair turns white and there is a white swelling, i.e. the mark is higher than the skin; (c) 'clean', if the mark spreads over the whole body. Verses 14-17, detailing the case in which 'raw flesh' appears on the skin, evidently do not belong to the original part of the *ṣāra'at* Torah¹⁷ but represent an addition of the same nature as vers. 2-8, due to a further question raised in the course of the discussion on the three original ordinances, to wit, how about the case when the flesh becomes raw at the suspicious spot? The 'Gemara' to the original decisions answers (vers. 14, 15) that the moment raw flesh appears the man is unclean, but that as in the other cases the decision must be rendered by a priest and after an inspection.¹⁸ Just as in the Talmud one question leads to the other, so in the implied discussion on the Biblical laws together with the decisions by the priests or by the later redactors of early codes, the situation is further complicated by the question: How about the case in which the raw flesh disappears and

¹⁷ See above, note 10, where it is suggested that the term 'raw flesh' and its synonym *miḥyah*, at the end of ver. 10, are additions due to the combination of the original decisions with the superimposed ones, i.e. of a Mishnah with a Gemara.

¹⁸ The words (ver. 15) 'the raw flesh is unclean' represent a further amplifying gloss.

the spot¹⁹ becomes white? The answer is 'clean' upon the inspection and the declaration of the priest.

The balance of the chapter, with the exception of vers. 45, 46, represents further additions to the original Torah, verses 18-39 taking up various skin troubles suggested by the consideration of the *šāra'at*. Within this supplement, verses 18-23 take up boils, verses 24-28 burns, raw flesh, bright marks, &c., verses 29-37 marks on the head or beard (*netek*), verses 38-9 very white marks (*bōhak*), and 40-44 baldness of the head and the dropping off of the hair of the eyebrows accompanied by the appearance of suspicious marks. With ver. 47 an entirely new subject—marks on garments or stuffs—is introduced, which is discussed up to the end of the chapter. These references, therefore, are entirely independent sections, so that the Mishnah and Gemara for *šāra'at* on the skin of a man or of a woman ends with ver. 44. The last two verses of this section (45-6) represent, I venture to think, a part again of the original *šāra'at* Torah. They read as follows:

'And the one afflicted with *šāra'at*²⁰ who has a mark, his garment shall be torn and his hair shall grow wild,²¹ and he shall cover the moustache²² and cry "unclean, unclean". As long as he has the spot he shall be unclean;²³ outside of the camp shall be his dwelling.'²⁴

¹⁹ The word *ha-nega'* must be supplied after נִגַּע in ver. 16, just as it is found in ver. 17.

²⁰ *šārūa'* (שָׂרָע), i. e. the one who has *šāra'at* of which *mešōrā'* (מְשָׁרַע), the pu'al participle (Lev. 14. 3) is a synonym, and the more common term occurring fifteen times as against five occurrences of *šārūa'*.

²¹ The tearing of the garments (סָרַח) and the growth of the hair (פָּרַח) are signs of mourning, hence forbidden to priests (Lev. 10. 6; 21. 10).

²² שֵׁפָף (*sāphām*) 'the lip beard', correctly rendered by the Greek version as *μύστραξ* in 2 Sam. 19. 25.

²³ The text has a superfluous 'he is unclean', perhaps a misplaced gloss.

²⁴ The words 'he shall dwell apart' represent again an addition with

The last verse of the chapter contains the subscript, and it is probable that the first part of the verse, 'This is the law of the *ṣāra'at* mark', belonged to the original form of the section, and was subsequently amplified into the subscript for the section on marks on garments. Be this as it may, we have at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter the second part of the original Torah, dealing with the purification or dismissal of the one whose mark has healed. This part, covering 14. 2-8 a, reads:

'This is the law of the one who has had *ṣāra'at*, on the day of his purification²⁵ when the priest has gone to (the place) outside of the camp, and has seen that the *ṣāra'at* mark of the *ṣārūa'* is healed.²⁶ Then the priest shall order two living birds²⁷ to be taken for the one to be purified, [and cedar wood and scarlet thread and hyssop;] and the priest shall order the one bird to be killed over

a view of adapting the decision to later social conditions when people dwelt in cities and not in camps. The addition is an answer to the question put in the style of the Gemara: 'How about the case of a *ṣārūa'* who lives in a city?' The general principle is in reply enunciated that the stricken individual must 'dwell apart', away from the habitations of his fellows. In similar fashion the Greek text to Lev. 14. 8, by changing 'outside of his tent' to 'outside of his house', adapts the older law to later conditions. See below, p. 375, note 45.

²⁵ The addition 'and he shall be brought unto the priest' is again added as a Gemara to adapt the law to the later conditions when the diseased person is merely isolated, and naturally must be brought to the priest. In the earlier social stage, however, when the diseased dwells outside of the camp, the priest goes to the place outside of the camp where the *ṣārūa'* dwells, and where the purification ritual is carried out, be it noted, *not* in a sanctuary.

²⁶ The more natural construction would be: **וְהָיָה נִרְפָּא הַצִּרְוֹעַ מִנֶּעֱרָה** instead of **וְהָיָה נִרְפָּא מִנֶּעֱרָה הַצִּרְוֹעַ**.

²⁷ Additions: (a) 'clean', and (b) then 'cedar wood, scarlet thread, and hyssop'.

an earthen pot²⁸ at running water;²⁹ and the living bird he shall dip into the blood of the slaughtered bird,³⁰ and he shall sprinkle over the one to be purified seven times and declare him clean, and send off the living bird into the open.³¹ And the one purified shall wash his garments, and shave all his hair, and wash in water, and after that come to the camp.'

Simple and primitive in character as this ritual appears to be, it is possible by a further analysis to detect several component elements pointing to the combination in the ritual itself of features that do not necessarily belong together. In the first place, the introduction of 'the cedar

²⁸ i. e. slaughtered so that the blood drops into an earthen pot.

²⁹ מֵיִם חַיִּים 'living water', which I take here in the sense of 'running water', i. e. at a stream, just as in the Babylonian-Assyrian purification ritual water from streams was used; e. g. Maḫlū Series, ed. Knudtzon, Tablet VII, 116, 'pure water of the deep which springs up in Eridu', or *Cun. Texts*, XVII, Pl. 38, 30-34, 'take an earthen vessel which has come from a large kiln, at the meeting of the streams draw water', &c. Cf. also Haupt, *Sumer.-Akkad. Keilschrift*, p. 90, III, 3-4, 'pure water, clear water, sparkling water', all in connexion with incantation and purification rituals. Langdon (*Transactions of the Third International Congress for the Hist. of Religions*, I, 249) has called attention to the fact that what he calls 'services for private devotion' were performed frequently by the banks of a river. The expression 'living water' was also extended to waters flowing into a well (Gen. 26. 19; Jer. 2. 13; 17. 13), but in the ritual I believe that 'running water' is always intended; so, e. g., Num. 19. 17. The use of מֵיִם חַיִּים in Lev. 15. 13 is inaccurate, and the Greek (Codd. BA fin.) omits חַיִּים, reading 'he shall wash his body in water', as throughout the chapter verses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 21, 27, and elsewhere.

³⁰ The awkward construction of the first half of verse 6, 'the living bird he shall take it', and its incongruity with the second half of the verse, betray attempts at combination and re-editing. I believe that the verse originally read: וְטָבַל אֶת־הַחֲפֹרֶת הַחַיָּה בְּדָם הַחֲפֹרֶת הַשְּׁחֻטָּה, to which an amplifying gloss added עַל הַפְּיִים הַחַיִּים.

³¹ Literally, 'over the face of the field', in the sense of allowing it to fly away.

wood, scarlet thread, and hyssop' has no apparent connexion with the ritual of the two birds. Outside of our passage we encounter these three objects together, (a) in the ritual for 'atoning' the house that has been affected by marks (Lev. 14. 49-53), which ritual is bodily taken over from our passage, and, therefore, has no independent significance, and (b) in the ceremony of the red heifer (Num. 19. 6) where 'the cedar wood, scarlet thread, and hyssop' are thrown into the 'burning heap of the heifer'—not even used for sprinkling, as is implied in the *šāra'at* ritual. The objects do not in fact seem to serve any particular purpose, and the ritual in all three cases is complete without them. The use of the hyssop alone (Num. 19. 14) in the case of the purification of the house and contents or furnishings belonging to some one who has become unclean through contact with a corpse or a grave, in which case the hyssop is dipped into water by 'a clean man', and sprinkled over the tent, the furniture and the inmates, shows that the main idea connected with hyssop is cleansing.³² The cedar wood in the *šāra'at* and in the 'red heifer' ritual appears to be a subsequent addition, both hyssop and cedar wood suggesting by their fragrance purification, like the burning of frankincense which in the case of *minḥah* or cereal offering is entirely burnt on the altar.³³ The scarlet thread, presumably for tying the mass together, introduces a further symbolism by nature of the red colour,³⁴ into which, however, we need

³² Note also the use of hyssop in Exod. 12. 22, where the 'purification' idea passes over into that of 'protection'.

³³ e. g. Lev. 2. 2, whereas of the meal and oil, and subsequently of the wine, only a handful is offered, while the rest is given to the priest.

³⁴ Cf. Isa. 1. 18, 'if your sins be red as scarlet', &c., suggested by a Jewish commentator in the *Mikra'ot Gedōlōt*.

not enter here. The hyssop³⁵ and cedar wood being thus associated with a cleansing process of a distinctive character, whereas the use to which the two birds are put is purely symbolical, the thought naturally suggests itself that hyssop and cedar wood were employed in the case of the person afflicted to afford him bodily relief—in other words, they formed part of the medical treatment in an early cultural stage, and on this account were combined with a ceremony intended to transfer the disease from the individual to an animal—in this instance a 'scape-bird'. That manifestly is the purpose to be served by the bird, to be sent off at large carrying with it the *ṣāra'at*. We thus have two distinct ideas introduced into the purification ritual in its present form: (a) a quasi-curative ceremony, and (b) a transfer of the disease. This combination further suggests that this part of the ritual itself was originally intended actually to free the afflicted from the *ṣāra'at*, and by the conservative force of established custom was retained as an ingredient of a later 'atoning'³⁶ ritual through the blood of a sacrificial animal. This double intent is confirmed by the usage of *לְמַטְהֵר* in Lev. 14. 4, and 7 for 'the one to be cleansed',³⁷ whereas in ver. 8 it is 'the one who has been purified'. We thus obtain three distinct ceremonies: (a) a primitive well-known method of exorcising disease by transferring it to an animal, for which we have so many instructive parallels among Babylonians³⁸ and other peoples,

³⁵ Note also Ps. 51. 9, 'purge me with hyssop'.

³⁶ Note that the term *לְמַטְהֵר*, i. e. 'to remove the sin', is used in Lev. 14. 49, 52, as well as in the passage in Ps. 51. 9, the latter evidently based on the ritual.

³⁷ The expression *בְּיוֹם טְהֻרָתוֹ* is, therefore, to be rendered as 'the day on which he is to be purified'.

³⁸ See *Cun. Texts*, XVII, Pl. 10, 73, 1-1; 11, 85, and the latest discussion

(*b*) a primitive remedial device, which consisted perhaps in rubbing the diseased person with hyssop, or in his inhaling the fragrance of hyssop; to hyssop, cedar wood was subsequently added, and the scarlet thread as a symbol of the sin or uncleanness; (*c*) an atoning ceremony by means of the 'blood' of a sacrificial animal with which the diseased individual was sprinkled.³⁹ By combining the three rites we obtain: (*a*) two birds; (*b*) the dipping of the cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet thread, as well as the dipping of the live bird into the blood of the one to be killed; (*c*) the sprinkling of the one to be declared clean with the blood—presumably through the cedar wood and hyssop tied together with the scarlet thread, though this is not specifically stated; (*d*) the dismissal of the live bird. The awkward construction of ver. 6, to which attention was called above, as well as the meaningless ceremony of dipping the live bird into the blood of the killed one, clearly shows that the introduction of the second bird is an after-thought. Once introduced, however, some means had to be found of connecting it with the first bird, and accordingly it was provided that the one bird should be dipped into the blood of the slaughtered one, and similarly the hyssop, &c., were to be dipped in the blood so as to connect this rite also with the killing of the second bird. It is obvious that the bird to be slaughtered is introduced as a result of the extension

of this and other passages in the incantation texts by Langdon in the *Expository Times*, vol. 24 (1912), pp. 40 ff., though Langdon's translations, it ought to be added, leave room for further study.

³⁹ 'Seven times' seems to have become the standing formula, though it is notable that not infrequently no number is specified, so, e.g., Lev. 5. 9; 16. 15; Num. 19. 18. Presumably in such cases seven was assumed as the number prescribed.

of the principle of killing a sacrificial animal of some kind in connexion with every atonement, or, to use the technical term, with every *ḥaṭṭāt* (חַטָּאת)⁴⁰—and the purification offering of the one who has had *ṣāra'at* falls within this category—demanding the killing of an animal. The old and primitive custom of using a bird as a scape-animal to which the *ṣāra'at* was transferred, would suggest by analogy the choice of a bird as the sacrificial animal. Lastly, the washing of the garment, the shaving of the hair of the body and the washing in water, were added to the ritual in accord with the general principle that after a period of uncleanness rites symbolical of the cleanly state upon which the individual now entered had to be performed. It is, of course, an open question whether in the earliest form of the purification ritual for the *ṣāra'at* this elaborate washing and shaving⁴¹ was included, but certainly at the

⁴⁰ The *ḥaṭṭāt* or 'sin-offering' rests on the same idea of the transfer of the disease to an animal, but the regulations regarding the *ḥaṭṭāt* represent a more advanced stage when the killing of the animal to which the disease was transferred had taken the place of merely sending it away, as was done with the wild goat of the Azazel rite. A bird or an untamed animal could be sent at large, but the domesticated sheep or bullock or ox would, of course, come back. This, together with the rise of an organized priesthood around a sanctuary and the practical need of providing an income for the priests, led to the change, involving the killing of the *ḥaṭṭāt*, the burning of those parts regarded as the vital organs, while the rest was given to the priests. Naturally, in the case of the 'sin-offering' for the high-priest or for the people, the entire animal was burned.

⁴¹ 'The washing of the garments and the bathing in water' is ordained throughout Lev. 15, for cases of bodily uncleanness; Lev. 17. 15 for one who has eaten 'abomination' or a 'torn' object (טֶרֶף *terēphah*); Lev. 16. 26-8 for the one who sends off Azazel and who burns the carcass of the 'sin-offering' bullock, and Num. 19. 8 for the one who burns the 'red heifer', and ver. 19 for the one who has come in contact with a corpse, as well as Num. 17. 21-2 for the one who has touched anything contaminated by a woman during her period. The shaving of the hair of the body is peculiar

stage when the three originally independent ceremonies were combined, the washing and shaving were also made a part of the ritual. Taking, therefore, the ritual as it stands we may distinguish in it earlier and later elements. The earlier elements are rites that originally were intended to exorcise the disease either by driving out the demon, as the cause of the disease, through the hyssop and cedar wood,⁴² or by transferring the disease (or what amounts to the same thing, transferring the demon) to some animal. Purification from the 'unclean' demon leads to the use of these rites as symbols of the ritualistic 'purification' at a later stage, when a ritual was compiled to mark the return of the victim to intercourse with his fellows. Instead of the diagnosis and cure, we have as part of the religious code the diagnosis and the official dismissal, both done

to the case of the one afflicted with *ṣāra'at*. In the case of the Nazarite (Num. 6. 18) only the hair of the head is to be shaved on the completion of the vow, though the underlying idea is the same as in the case of the *ṣāra'at* ordinance.

⁴² No sharp distinction can be drawn in the medicine of primitive peoples between an attempted cure by certain remedies and the exorcising of the demon through these remedies. The primary purpose of medicaments was to force the demon out through bad smells or to coax him out through fragrant odours. The benefit to the patient followed as a natural corollary. A cure was thus a release from the throes of the demon, but no doubt in time the positive aspects of medicaments as the common-sense view must have come to the front, though in the background there still stood the old conception of disease due to some unclean spirit which of its own accord or through the machinations of some sorcerer or witch had found its way into the body and was causing the trouble. It is rather strange how in this way the most primitive theory of disease touches modern pathology with its germ theory as an external substance that has found a favourable condition for growth in the body. Similarly, the crude belief of the savage, that death is not a necessary part of the order of nature but was introduced through special circumstances, anticipates to a certain extent the views of some modern biologists. See Frazer, *Belief in Immortality*, I, p. 84.

through the priest. The more distinctly religious element, which is also the later one, is the bringing of a sacrifice, and probably the ritual bath and shaving of the hair. The *šāra'at* code in its oldest compiled form thus consists of Lev. 13. 2-3, 9-13 and 14. 2-8 a, minus (a) the subsequent additions, comments, and glosses in both the diagnosis and the dismissal, and minus (b) the combination in the ritual of dismissal of four originally distinct elements, two of them of earlier and two of later origin.

In order to furnish a summary of the results thus far reached, I add the original⁴³ *šāra'at* legislation, forming a little Torah by itself:

אדם כִּי־יִהְיֶה בְּעוֹר בְּשָׂרוֹ נֹגַע צֹרַעַת וְהִוָּבֵא אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־
הַנֹּגַע בְּעוֹר־הַבָּשָׂר וְשָׁעָר בִּנְגַע הַפֶּה לָבֵן וּמֵרָאָה הַנֹּגַע עֹמֵק מֵעוֹר בְּשָׂרוֹ נֹגַע
צֹרַעַת הוּא וְטָמֵא אֹתוֹ

נֹגַע צֹרַעַת כִּי תִהְיֶה בְּאָדָם וְהִוָּבֵא אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה שְׂאֵת־
לִבָּנָה בְּעוֹר וְהִיא הַפֶּכָה שָׁעָר לָבֵן צֹרַעַת נֹשֶׁנֶת הִיא בְּעוֹר בְּשָׂרוֹ וְטָמֵאֻ
הַכֹּהֵן

וְאִם־פִּרוּחַ תִּפְרַח הַצֹּרַעַת בְּעוֹר וְכִסְתָּהּ הַצֹּרַעַת אֶת בְּלִי־הָעוֹר וְרָאָה
הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה כִסְתָּהּ הַצֹּרַעַת אֶת־בְּלִי־בְשָׂרוֹ וְטָהַר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַנֹּגַע
וְהִצְרִיעַ אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ הַנֹּגַע בְּגִדָיו יִהְיֶה פָרָמִים וְרֹאשׁוֹ יִהְיֶה פָרוּעַ וְעַל־שֵׁפָם
יַעֲטָה וְטָמֵא טָמֵא יִקְרָא כָּל־יָמֵי אֲשֶׁר הַנֹּגַע בּוֹ יִטָּמֵא מִחוּץ לַמִּחֲנֶה מִוֹשְׁבֵי
וְאֵת תְּהִיָּה תוֹרֵת הַמִּצְרָע בְּיוֹם טָהֲרָתוֹ וַיֵּצֵא הַכֹּהֵן אֶל־מִחוּץ לַמִּחֲנֶה
וְרָאָה הַכֹּהֵן וְהִנֵּה נִרְפָּא הַצֹּרַע מִנֹּגַע־הַצֹּרַעַת וְצִוָּה הַכֹּהֵן וְלָקַח לַמִּטְהָר
שְׁתֵּי צִפְרִים חַיִּים וְצִוָּה הַכֹּהֵן וְשָׁחַט אֶת־הַצִּפּוֹר הָאֶחָת אֶל־בְּלִי־חַרֶּשׁ

⁴³ Original, in a qualified sense, for we are not in a position to restore the original character of the 'purification' or 'dismissal' section beyond the point above indicated, namely, that originally the rite was remedial and purificatory through the transfer of the disease or of the demon of the disease into the bird sent out at large. The ritual in this stage probably consisted of incantation formulae pronounced over the afflicted person with rites of sympathetic magic to induce the disease to pass over into the bird.

על־מים חיים וטבל את־הצפור החיה בדם הצפור השחטה והזה על
 המטהר מן־הצרעת שבע פעמים וטהרו ושלח את־הצפור החיה על־פני
 השדה וכבס המטהר את־בגדיו ונלח את־כל־שעריו ורחץ במים ואחר יבוא
 אל־המחנה

זאת תורת הצרעת

‘If a man has on the skin of his flesh a *ṣāra’at*-mark and he is brought to the priest, and the priest sees the mark on the skin of his flesh, and that the hair at the mark has turned white, and that the mark appears deeper than the skin of his flesh, then it is a *ṣāra’at* mark, and he shall declare him unclean.

‘If there is a *ṣāra’at* mark on a man, and he is brought to the priest, and the priest sees that there is a white swelling on the skin which has turned the hair white, it is a chronic *ṣāra’at* on the skin of his flesh, and the priest shall declare him unclean.

‘But if the *ṣāra’at* gradually spreads on the skin until the *ṣāra’at* covers the entire skin, and the priest sees that the *ṣāra’at* covers the entire flesh, then the priest shall declare the mark clean.

‘And the one afflicted with *ṣāra’at* who has a mark, his garments shall be torn, and his hair shall grow wild, and he shall cover his moustache, and cry ‘unclean, unclean’. As long as he has the spot he shall be unclean; outside of the camp shall be his dwelling.

‘This is the law of the one who has *ṣāra’at*, on the day of his purification when the priest has gone to (the place) outside of the camp, and has seen that the *ṣāra’at* mark of the one afflicted with *ṣāra’at* is healed. Then the priest shall order two living birds to be taken for the one to be purified; and the priest shall order the one bird to be killed

over an earthen pot at running water ; and the living bird he shall dip into the blood of the killed bird, and he shall sprinkle over the one to be purified seven times, and declare him clean, and send off the living bird into the open. And the one purified shall wash his garments, and shave all his hair, and wash in water, and after that come to the camp. This is the law of the *ṣāra'at*.' ⁴⁴

III

A significant feature of this original form of the *ṣāra'at* code is its disassociation from any sanctuary. The victim, to be sure, is brought to the priest, but no ceremonies are enacted in any sanctuary, and the rite of purification or dismissal is carried out outside of the camp where the isolated victim dwells. Even the sacrificial bird is not killed at any altar. The case is different in a second ritual of purification beginning with Lev. 14. 8 b, and extending to 16. The independent character of this second ritual has, of course, been recognized by commentators.⁴⁵

This second code reads, exclusive of comments and additions, as follows :

'And he shall dwell outside of his tent ⁴⁶ seven days,⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Subscript now at the end of Lev. 14. 57. See below, p. 399.

⁴⁵ See, e. g., Baentsch, *Leviticus*, p. 371.

⁴⁶ The Greek translation, evidently with a view of adapting the ritual to later social conditions when people dwelt in cities, reads 'outside of his house'. See above, note 24.

⁴⁷ Verse 9, reading 'And on the seventh day he shall shave all his hair [explanatory comment : his head and his beard and his eyebrows, and all his hair he shall shave], and wash his garments, and bathe his body in water, and be clean', is an addition taken from verse 8 a in order to make the second ritual conform with the first. The additions, 'his head', &c., are again in the nature of a Gemara, and represent the answers of the priest to the questions that would be asked as to what constitutes 'all his hair'. Does it mean the hair of the head? Yes. The beard? Yes. How about

and on the eighth day he shall take one lamb⁴⁸ and three-twentieths of fine flour mixed with oil,⁴⁹ and the priest shall place the one to be declared clean⁵⁰ before Jahweh.⁵¹ And the priest shall take the lamb⁵² and offer it as a guilt-offering,⁵³ and he shall kill the lamb in a holy place.⁵⁴ And the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt-offering, and the priest shall put (it) on the right ear-lap of the one to be declared clean, and on the right

the eyebrows? Yes. Some one not satisfied with this added, 'All his hair he shall shave'—to include the hairs on the breast, abdomen, legs, arms, and no doubt a strict construction in the spirit of Talmudical casuistry would include the hair around the privates.

⁴⁸ It is quite evident that originally only one lamb as a sin-offering (זֶבֶחַ חַטָּאת) was sacrificed. The brief manner in which the second lamb is introduced in ver. 19 a, 'and the priest shall carry out (עָשָׂה) the sin-offering (זֶבֶחַ חַטָּאת) and atone for the one to be cleaned' [addition: from his uncleanness], shows that the second lamb as a sin-offering is an after-thought, just as the 'ewe, one year old, perfect' (ver. 10 b), and which (19 b) he shall afterwards slaughter as a burnt-offering (זֶבֶחַ עֹלָה), are further additions in regard to which it is specified (ver. 20), 'and the priest shall offer up the burnt-offering [addition: and the meal-offering (זֶבֶחַ מִנְחָה) at the altar], and the priest shall atone for him, and he shall be clean'. The repetition of the phrase, 'he shall atone for the one to be cleansed', or 'he shall atone for him' in the case of the second lamb, and in the case of the one-year-old ewe is in itself sufficient to show that the ritual has been elaborated at a later period. The additions, 'and the *minhāh*' and 'at the altar', are again answers to the questions, (1) Is there to be a cereal-offering also with the burnt-offering? Yes: and (2) Shall it be offered at the altar just as the burnt-offering? Yes.

⁴⁹ Addition, 'one *log* of oil'.

⁵⁰ Explanatory comments: (a) i. e. 'the man to be cleaned', and (b) addition, 'and them'.

⁵¹ Explanatory comment: 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting', in answer to the question, 'What does "before Jahweh" mean?'

⁵² Addition, 'one'.

⁵³ Additions, (1) 'and the *log* of oil', and (2) 'wave them as a waving before Jahweh.'

⁵⁴ Explanatory comments: (a) 'in the place where one (usually) slaughters the sin-offering', to which some one added, (b) 'and the burnt-

thumb and on the right (large) toe.⁵⁵ And the priest shall sprinkle⁵⁶ of the oil seven times before Jahweh⁵⁷ . . . and the priest shall atone for him before Jahweh.'

The addition of an official sacrificial animal in cases involving purification from uncleanness to an earlier ritual, in which the leading idea was the exorcising of the unclean spirit, is a characteristic feature of the Priestly Code. So in Lev. 15, dealing with purification in the case of an unclean flow, the sacrificial regulations for the eighth day, vers. 14-15 and

offering', i. e. the 'holy place' means the altar on which sin- and burnt-offerings are usually brought. Other commentators added (c) 'for the guilt-offering (חטאת) is like a sin-offering (זבח) ', i. e. the two are on a level and to be treated alike. Cf. Lev. 7. 7. (d) 'It is holy of holies', (e) 'it is the priest's'. All five comments are, therefore, again in the nature of a Gemara to the Mishnah, answering such questions as (a) where is the 'holy place'? (b) why does he say 'guilt-offering' and not 'sin-offering'? (c) to whom does the guilt-offering belong? &c., &c.

⁵⁵ Ver. 15, 'And the priest shall take of the *log* of oil, and pour it on the left palm of the priest', is clearly a later addition, harking back to the 'one *log* of oil'. Note the awkward repetition of the word 'priest'.

⁵⁶ Addition, 'with his finger'.

⁵⁷ Ver. 16 a, 'And the priest shall dip with his right finger of the oil which is on his left palm', is an explanatory amplification superinduced by ver. 15, and representing the attempt to combine the oil of the *minḥah* with the 'log of oil'. Ver. 17 is a further specification of what is to be done with the remaining oil; an answer, therefore, to a question, 'How about the oil that is left in the palm of the priest?' Answer, 'The rest of the oil which is on his palm, the priest shall put on the right ear-lap of the one to be purified, and on his right thumb, and on his right (large) toe'; taken over, therefore, from ver. 14. An explanatory comment further adds, 'over the blood of the guilt-offering' that has been placed on the parts named (ver. 14). Then some one asks, Suppose there is still some oil left in the palm of the priest, what then? Answer (ver. 18 a), 'And what is left of the oil which is in the palm of the priest, he shall pour on the head of the one to be purified'. It is to be noted that the Greek text occasionally omits the word 'priest'; so e.g. at the beginning of vers. 15 and 16, and occasionally inserts it; so e.g. in ver. 18, after 'he gives' (נתן), where the Hebrew omits it, pointing to considerable manipulation of the formal language of the ordinances.

29-30, are clearly insertions, shown to be such by the preceding verse which in each case (ver. 13 and ver. 28) ends by stating that the individual is 'clean'. Again in the 'atone-ment' ritual, Lev. 16, the second goat as a sin-offering (ver. 5) is an addition to the far older goat for Azazel, i. e. the goat to which the sin or uncleanness is to be transferred, just as the ram for the burnt-offering and the bullock of the sin-offering represent further layers. Similarly, in the Holiness Code, we come across this latter 'sacrificial' layer over an older one in which the sacrifice of an animal for the benefit of the priestly sanctuary does not enter into consideration. The twenty-third chapter of Leviticus, detailing festival regulations, the ordinances for the Passover, of unleavened cakes, abstaining from work on the first and seventh day,⁵⁸ and the waving of the Omer, as set forth in vers. 5-11 and ver. 14, constitutes the earlier stratum, whereas verses 12-13, adding a lamb as a burnt-offering, and a *minḥah*, are insertions of a much later date. The same applies to the sacrificial ritual, vers. 18-20, which clearly represents an artificial attempt to connect an earlier ritual of 'waving' a cereal offering at the end of the grain harvest with the 'waving' of sacrificial animals. In the case of the 'Atonement' festival (vers. 23-32), it is noticeable that no sacrifice is mentioned at all, again pointing to the late addition of the goat introduced in Lev. 16. 5, &c., for the day.

The fact that the sacrificial ritual is prescribed for the eighth day⁵⁹ after everything is over shows that the older

⁵⁸ Ver. 8a, 'Ye shall bring a fire-offering to Jahweh for seven days' is an insertion to conform with the Priestly Code, Num. 28. 19-24, where the fire-offering is fully set forth and in great detail.

⁵⁹ Just as in Lev. 15. 14-15 and 29-30.

and essential element in this second ritual is the washing of the garments, the bathing and the shaving, as in the first ritual. Furthermore, the many additions in the case of the sacrificial ritual point to the tendency to emphasize the sacrifice as the essential element. The one animal as a sin-offering, which according to the present law (ver. 21) is permitted as a substitute only in case the individual is poor, was all that the sacrificial ritual in its earlier form required; and we are probably right in assuming that this earlier form followed the regulation of Lev. 4. 32, which prescribes a ewe as the guilt-offering.⁶⁰ To this a lamb as a burnt-offering (עֹלָה) was added; and not satisfied with this, an entirely unwarranted differentiation was introduced between a guilt-offering (זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת) and a sin-offering (זֶבַח חַטֹּאת),⁶¹

⁶⁰ The little section (Lev. 4. 32-5) represents a different practice from the sections (a) Lev. 4. 3-12, (b) 4. 13-21, (c) 4. 22-26, (d) 4. 27-31, prescribing, according as the transgression is one committed by an anointed priest, by the whole people, by a chief, or by an ordinary individual, a bullock for the first two cases, a young goat for the third instance, and a young female goat for the fourth case.

⁶¹ The three offerings, עֹלָה, זֶבַח חַטֹּאת and זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת, are found in Ezekiel (e. g. 40. 39), but in the Priestly Code (Lev. 5 and 7) no distinction is recognizable between זֶבַח חַטֹּאת and זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת, and a commentator is, therefore, free to admit (Lev. 7. 7) that 'a sin-offering (זֶבַח חַטֹּאת) is like a guilt-offering (זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת)—one law'. Evidently, the difference between the two was originally merely one of local usage of the term; in one locality, now represented by ch. 5. 1-16, זֶבַח חַטֹּאת being used, in another place, now represented by the little section 5. 17-26, and ch. 7, זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת was employed. Of the two terms, זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת ('*ašam*') seems to represent the older usage. The זֶבַח חַטֹּאת, therefore, is the one added in Lev. 14, in accord with the tendency to increase sacrifices, though the result is a double sin-offering, since there is no distinction between '*ašam*' and *ḥaṭṭāṭ*. The regular addition of the *ōlāh* (burnt-offering) to a *ḥaṭṭāṭ* (sin-offering) is again an illustration of this tendency, though here a factor involved is the consciousness that the sin-offering rests upon the old notion of the transfer of the disease or sin to the animal, whereas the 'burnt-offering' is the tribute to the angered deity who is to be appeased by the 'pleasant fragrance', which is what the phrase

and thus another lamb was added; and lastly, a cereal offering (מִנְחָה) was attached,⁶² making, therefore, no less than four separate sacrifices. Even with this the process of heaping up one layer after the other upon the sacrificial ritual was not completed. The ordinary cereal offering for a lamb consisted of one-tenth of an *ephah* of fine meal, mixed with oil,⁶³ but in our case the amount is raised to three-twentieths,⁶⁴ and besides the mixture of the flour with oil, a special quantity (*log*) of oil is added (Lev. 14. 10 c, 12 b, 15 a).⁶⁵ The 'waving' of the sacrificial animal is prescribed (ver. 12 b), the elaborate ceremonial of touching the ear, finger, and toe of the individual with the oil,⁶⁶ the sprinkling seven times 'before Jahweh',⁶⁷ again a touching of the ear, יָדָיו וְרִגְלָיו originally connoted. The 'substitute' offering (Lev. 5. 11) of one-tenth of an *ephah* of fine meal in the case of one too poor to offer two turtle-doves or two young pigeons belongs, of course, in a different category. It is not attached to another offering, nor is it ever technically designated as a מִנְחָה but as חֲטָאת (ver. 12), though a misplaced note, 'it shall be for the priest as a *minḥah*' (ver. 13 b), shows that some pedant could not tolerate a bloodless offering to be called a *ḥatṭāt*. In Num. 6, a compilation of various layers dealing with the one who has made a vow, the cereal-offering is added to the burnt-offering, sin-offering, and peace-offering at the termination of the vow period (vers. 15-18), though the word מִנְחָה is only introduced in the gloss or comment at the end of ver. 15. This is heaping up sacrifices with a vengeance, due to the endeavour to legitimize an old custom of temporary consecration by giving to the one who makes a vow the temporary status of a priest.

⁶² There is no *minḥah* attached to the *ḥatṭāt* or 'ašam in Lev. 4. 5, 7.

⁶³ The mixture with oil is a constant factor of the *minḥah*, expressed (Lev. 2. 1, 15) by 'oil poured upon it'. On the other hand, the 'frankincense' (לִבְנָה) also prescribed with the *minḥah* was not carried out, at least not in the practice, which is set forth in Lev. 2.

⁶⁴ Also Num. 15. 9; 28. 12, 20, 28; 29. 14.

⁶⁵ This measure of oil occurs in this chapter only.

⁶⁶ Part of the ceremony of initiation of priests, Exod. 29. 20; Lev. 8. 23, 24, though here the blood is used to make the priest immune against demons.

⁶⁷ The expression 'before Jahweh' is evidently looked upon as identical with 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting', and, therefore, the latter

&c., of the individual with oil, and anointing the head with what is left (ver. 18). Verse 19 specifies the addition of a 'sin-offering' and a 'burnt-offering', and verse 20 is a comment in the nature of a Gemara to indicate that the burnt-offering is to have its cereal offering accompaniment, just as the sin or guilt-offering. We thus find this section overloaded with sacrificial regulations in accordance with the tendency towards a steadily-increasing elaboration of sanctuary ceremonials, so characteristic of the later layers of the Priestly Code.⁶⁸

This rather lengthy discussion was necessary to show

phrase is added as a gloss in ver. 11, and so also Lev. 15. 14, as well as Lev. 4. 5, where the gloss has been placed before the words 'before Jahweh'. In Exod. 29 and Lev. 8, furnishing the rites for the initiation of priests in two recensions, the expression used is 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting', from which we may conclude that the sections prescribing the wafers and the basket of unleavened bread, together with the 'waving' (Exod. 29. 23-4; Lev. 8. 26-7) where 'before Jahweh' is used, represent elements from some other source. In Lev. 1-7, therefore, as well as Lev. 13-16, the characteristic expression is 'before Jahweh', and wherever the other appears (e. g. also Lev. 15. 29) it is to be regarded as an explanatory addition. In the Holiness Code, likewise, אֶהְיֶה מוֹעֵד appears to be the later addition, though this Code uses by the side of לִפְנֵי יְהוָה (19. 22; 23. 11; 20-28; 24. 4-6) the simple phrase לִיהוָה (Lev. 17. 5 b, 9; 19. 21; 22. 22, 27; 23. 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 25, 27, 38, 41; 24. 7, &c.). Even Lev. 17. 4, 9, the words 'to the entrance of the tent of meeting', despite their position, are explanatory glosses, in the former passage to מִשְׁכַּן יְהוָה, in the latter to לִיהוָה. Sections in which the phrase 'at the entrance of the tent of meeting' is the original reading (e. g. Exod. 29 and Lev. 8) represent an older stratum of legislation, and may very well date back *in substance* to a very early period; whereas the phrase 'before Jahweh' shows that the compiler has in mind the sanctuary of Jerusalem, the gloss being added to conform to the theory that the *entire* legislation reverts to the day of Moses.

⁶⁸ A good illustration of this tendency towards overloading is furnished by a comparison of the sacrifices for the new moon prescribed in Ezek. 46. 6 with the additions made in Num. 28. 11, one young bullock as against two, six lambs as against seven. See Carpenter and Battersby, *The Hexateuch*, I, p. 128.

the wide abyss between the first ritual (Lev. 14. 1-8), not performed in a sanctuary and with but little added to the exorcising rites though converted into a purification or dismissal ceremony, and the second ritual, which attaches to a simple cleansing ceremony a most elaborate series of sacrificial rites.

In the same spirit the substitute ritual, vers. 21-27, is conceived, permitting the poor man to bring merely one lamb, reducing the amount of the meal to one-tenth, and replacing the second lamb and the ewe by two turtle-doves or two pigeons. I have suggested⁶⁹ that what is here permitted as a substitute may have been the offering prescribed for an earlier period. Be that as it may, the dependence of this section upon the preceding one is instanced by the introduction of the *log* of oil (vers. 22, 24), and the ceremony of sprinkling and touching the ear-lap of the individual (vers. 25-29), identical with vers. 14-19, and taken over bodily from the latter, just as the wording in vers. 30-31 is taken from ver. 19.⁷⁰ Then follows a separate subscript for this section (vers. 21-31), but in which the words **וְאֵשֶׁר לֹא תִשִּׁי יָדוֹ** are probably an addition, so that the subscript belonging originally after ver. 20, or perhaps after 8a, once read 'This is the Torah for the cleansing of the one who has a *nega' šāra'at*'.

⁶⁹ Above, p. 379. Cf. the substitute which is provided for the guilt- (or sin-) offering, Lev. 5. 7-10 (two turtle-doves or two pigeons without a *minḥah*), and a further substitute for the one who cannot even afford this (vers. 11-12) of one-tenth of an *ephah* of meal without oil or frankincense. This, of course, is not a *minḥah* in the ordinary sense. The word **בְּמִנְחָה** at the end of ver. 13 is clearly a late addition.

⁷⁰ The correct construction is **וְעִשָּׂה אֶת־הָאֶחָד מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּשִּׁי יָדוֹ חֲמֵאָה** וְאֶת־הָאֶחָד עֲלֶיהָ. To this a commentator adds as a note, 'the one', namely, 'of the turtle-doves or of the pigeons which he can afford'.

IV

Having now discussed the original form of the diagnosis and treatment of the *ṣāra'at* and the purification or dismissal rites of the one who has been healed of it, we may proceed to an analysis of the remaining sections of Lev. 13-14, namely, (a) Lev. 13. 4-8; (b) 14-17; (c) 18-23; (d) 24-28; (e) 29-37; (f) 38-39; (g) 40-44; (h) 47-58; (i) 14. 33-53. The first section deals with the 'shining spot' (*baheret*) on the skin and the 'growth' (*sappaḥat* or *mispahat*).⁷¹ In contrast to the case (ver. 3) where the hair at the mark has turned white and the mark is deeper than the skin, in which case it is pronounced a *ṣāra'at*, or (ver. 9) where the swelling on the skin (i. e. a mark higher than the skin) has turned white, in which case it is likewise *ṣāra'at* of a chronic type, the case is put forward (ver. 4) of a white mark not sunk in the skin (i. e. even with the surface) and where the hair has not turned white. Such a case is regarded as a 'suspect', and the individual is put under guard for seven days. If after seven days there is no change, another seven days' observation is ordained. After that two contingencies are instanced, either (a) the mark has grown fainter and not spread, in which case it is pronounced a harmless 'growth' and the suspect is dismissed as clean,⁷² or (b) the growth *after* the formal dismissal spreads, in which case the suspect is unclean. According to the close of ver. 8 it is declared

⁷¹ See above, p. 360. In ver. 1 the terms *שֵׁנֶת אוֹ כִּפְחָת אוֹ בַּהֲרֵת* are an insertion to make the heading conform to the contents of vers. 1-13. The *שֵׁנֶת* is treated ver. 10 *seq.* The more natural order of the insertion would have been, *baheret*, *sappaḥat*, and *se'et*. An interesting reference to the various kinds of *negā'im* is found Deut. 17. 8.

⁷² Addition (ver. 6 c), 'he shall wash his clothes'. The addition probably read in full 'he shall wash his garments and bathe in water', but it is here given in an abbreviated form.

to be *ṣāra'at*, but I am inclined to regard this as a later addition made at a time when *ṣāra'at* was used in a very general sense for any skin disease which was regarded as unclean.⁷³ At all events, the spreading growth is not of the same order as the *ṣāra'at* described in vers. 3 and 10.

The second section (vers. 14–18) takes up the case where raw flesh appears in connexion with a mark which (vers. 14–15) is declared unclean. The double decision (*a*) טָמֵא הוּא 'it is unclean', and (*b*) צִרְעָתָהּ הִיא 'it is *ṣāra'at*' at the end of ver. 15 is suspicious, and I am inclined to regard the second decision again as a later addition to be explained as the one at the end of ver. 8. Correspondingly, the decision 'he is clean' is rendered in case the raw flesh turns white, and after the priest has satisfied himself that the spot has turned white. The raw flesh turning white simply means, therefore, that the skin assumes its natural appearance. These two sections, therefore, are in the nature of a Gemara to the original form of the *ṣāra'at* Mishnah, as above set forth. Precisely as in the talmudical discussions, various questions are asked, such as how about a white shining mark which is not deeper than the skin, and where the hair has not turned white? Answer: Such an one is to be observed for seven days. Suppose the mark remains unchanged? Answer: Observe him for another seven days. If it grows faint and does not spread? Answer: טָהוֹר 'he is clean'. Suppose it comes back and spreads? Answer: טָמֵא 'unclean'. How about raw flesh on the skin? Answer: טָמֵא 'unclean'. Suppose the raw flesh turns white? Answer: טָהוֹר 'clean'. In a practical hand-book the discussions are omitted and the decisions alone are given.

The third section continues the 'Gemara', and like the

⁷³ See below, pp. 389, 392, and 400 f.

talmudical Gemara grows in complication as question follows fast upon question. How about the case of a boil (*šehin*) that is healed, but after the healing process 'a white shining spot'⁷⁴ even with the surface appears?⁷⁵ Verse 20 gives the answer: 'The priest shall examine (it), and if it is deeper⁷⁶ than the skin and the hair has turned white, the priest shall declare him unclean'.⁷⁷ The commentator quotes the established diagnosis. Nothing is added to the law—merely an answer given to a question that appears to be asked from a theoretical rather than from a practical motive—an early variety of the 'hypothetical question'. The question, however, having once been asked, the other case as in ver. 4, must be considered: suppose the hair has not turned white, and the spot does not appear lower⁷⁸ than the skin. The answer is: The priest is to shut him up as a suspect for seven days, just as in ver. 4. Verse 22, corresponding to ver. 7, decides that if the spot spreads,⁷⁹ it furnishes the decision 'unclean' with the usual subsequent addition נֶגַע (*nega'*), i. e. abbreviated for 'it is a *šāra'at* mark'.⁸⁰ Similarly, the question is also put here: Suppose

⁷⁴ Some commentator who wanted to be very exact added (v. 19) 'reddish', since as a matter of fact a shining spot, even when it appears to be white, is tinged with red. The words 'white' and 'swelling' are also added.

⁷⁵ An explanatory comment, misplaced at the end of ver. 20, says 'spread where the boil (was)'.

⁷⁶ The text uses שֶׁכֶּה for 'deep' instead of עֶמֶק in vers. 3-4, indicative of another writer, or of a different stratum.

⁷⁷ Once more the later addition 'it is a *nega' šāra'at*', as above (see note 4).

⁷⁸ The words וְהָיָה כָּהֵן (ver. 21) 'and it is faint' are not in place. I suspect an abbreviated note to indicate, as in ver. 6, that if after seven days 'the spot has grown faint and has not spread' the suspect is dismissed.

⁷⁹ Again given in abbreviated form. We must supply 'reappears and spreads' after the dismissal, as in ver. 7.

⁸⁰ The very fact that we encounter the abbreviated form in the decision

the 'shining spot' remains stationary, and does not spread? The answer should be as in ver. 5—a further observation of seven days. Here, however, a new diagnosis is given. When such a spot appears on the skin where there had been a boil, the stationary character after seven days shows that it is the scar of the boil (צִרְכָּת הַשָּׁחִין), and the decision, therefore, is טָהוֹר 'clean'. The same lengthy discussion follows in the next 'Gemara'—the fourth section (vers. 24–28)—where the case is put of a white spot appearing in connexion with a burn. The hypothetical question originally read as follows:⁸¹ 'If there should be on his skin a burn, and the healed burn⁸² should become a white shining spot.'⁸³

Once more the ordinary diagnosis is repeated: If the hair has turned white at the shining spot, and the spot is deeper⁸⁴ than the skin, it is unclean.⁸⁵ If neither of these symptoms appears,⁸⁶ the suspect is observed for seven days; if, at the end of that time, the spot spreads, he is unclean;⁸⁷ 'if the shining spot remains stationary, with-
ṣāra'at (vers. 8, 15), by the side of *nega' ṣāra'at* (ver. 20) and *nega'* (ver. 22), shows the very general and conventional usage acquired by *ṣāra'at* as a generic term, and not as a specific designation.

⁸¹ Hebrew text או ('or'), whereas the Greek version has 'and'.

⁸² Text מַחֲמֵית הַמִּכָּוָה, which appears to be a semi-technical term for the burn that has been healed, corresponding to the healed boil in the fourth section.

⁸³ Addition again (ver. 24) as above in ver. 19, 'reddish', i. e. 'reddish white', to which another commentator added 'or white', to indicate that a 'white' *ṣāra'at* includes a shining spot entirely white, or reddish, i. e. white tinged with red.

⁸⁴ Here (ver. 25) עָמֵק is used as in ver. 3–4, but immediately thereafter (ver. 26) שָׁפֵלָה.

⁸⁵ Again the usual conventional addition, 'it is a *nega' ṣāra'at*', i. e. a '*ṣāra'at* mark'.

⁸⁶ The words 'and it is faint' are again out of place here, as above note 78.

⁸⁷ With the addition, 'it is a *nega' ṣāra'at*'.

out spreading in the skin,⁸⁸ the priest pronounces him clean, since it is a (mere) 'scar of a burn'.

The fifth section takes up and discusses in great detail (vers. 29–37) the various symptoms connected with marks or sores on the head or beard, to which the generic designation of *netek*⁸⁹ is given, and which are evidently open sores of some kind. The introductory statement reads:

'If a man⁹⁰ has a mark (*nega'*) on the head or beard, and the priest sees it, and it appears deeper than the skin, and there is thin shining hair⁹¹ in it, then the priest shall declare him unclean—it is an open sore⁹² (נֶחֱק).'

The two tests of the diagnosis: (1) that the spot is deeper than the skin; (2) the appearance of a yellowish hair indicating that the sore has changed the colour of the

⁸⁸ Two comments, (a) 'it is (also) faint', to make the verse correspond to ver. 6; (b) שְׁאֵת הַמִּכּוּהָ הִיא 'it is the swelling (*se'et*) of the burn' (*ha-mikwah*), as a variant to צֶרֶבֶת הַמִּכּוּהָ הִיא 'it is a scar of a burn'.

⁸⁹ The Greek renders it by *τραῦμα* 'wound'. The underlying stem means 'to pull off violently', showing that *netek* must be an open sore through the pulling away of the skin, a kind of ulcer. Just as we have נָנַע and צָרַעַת, so נָנַע הַנֶּחֱק (ver. 31) is used by the side of נֶחֱק; and נָנַע is used to designate a נֶחֱק (ver. 32) as well as צָרַעַת.

⁹⁰ The text adds 'or woman', but the continuation shows that only man was here referred to, though naturally the law, as all laws dealing with disease or sin, applies to both sexes. In ver. 38, on the other hand, the words 'man or woman' belong to the original form of the little section, which is moreover misplaced; similarly, Lev. 20. 27 or Exod. 35. 29, but, on the other hand, 'woman' is added by a later hand in Num. 6. 2, as is shown by a comparison with Lev. 27. 2, while Num. 5. 6 both 'man' and 'woman' are added, the text reading simply, 'speak to the Bene Israel', as in ver. 2 'command the Bene Israel'.

⁹¹ שְׁאֵת (צֶהב) used only in this chapter and in Ezra 8. 27, in the latter passage of a copper vessel.

⁹² Addition, 'it is a *ṣāra'at* on the head or beard', clearly marked as such by the repetition of the word הָרָא.

hair at the spot, are precisely of the same character as given in the preceding section, with the comparatively unimportant difference as to the nature of the change in the colour of the hair. The difference between white or reddish white or shining might easily be a subjective differentiation, the fact being that the change in the pigment of the hair brings about a colour that is not pure white, and may, therefore, be designated as reddish, or reddish and white, or simply shining.

The following verses 31-37 again show traces of many later additions and of re-editing. The original text must have run as follows:

‘If the priest sees that the *netek*⁹³ mark is not deeper than the skin, and there is no shining⁹⁴ hair in it, then the priest shall shut up the *netek* for seven days, and if on the seventh day the priest sees the mark and behold the *netek* has not spread,⁹⁵ then he shaves himself,⁹⁶ and

⁹³ Text, נָנַע הַנֶּתֶק. See note 89.

⁹⁴ The Hebrew text has ‘black hair’ (perhaps a variant that has replaced *śāhōb*), for which the Greek version has the correct form ‘shining hair’.

⁹⁵ Addition, ‘and there is no shining hair in it, and the *netek* is not deeper than the skin’; the inversion pointing to the fact that it is a later explanatory amplification or note.

⁹⁶ The Greek version says ‘he shaves his skin’; evidently a cleansing ceremony like washing the garments and bathing in water if the mark is on the body. A second procedure in the case of a suspected mark provided that the victim ‘must not shave the *netek*’ (ver. 33), and must be shut up for seven days. The two procedures were erroneously combined, and so we have in ver. 33, for *no reason whatsoever*, a second period of seven days’ observation. It may be, too, that the second test of seven days is misplaced, and belongs in connexion with ver. 37, where the *netek*, after the first seven days, remains unchanged, and which would then correspond with ver. 5. At all events, vers. 33-4, beginning with וְאִתֵּהֶנָּק לֹא יִנָּלֵחַ and extending to וְטָהַר אֹתוֹ הַכֹּהֵן, are originally a duplicate of ver. 32 with the addition of the words וְטָהַר בְּגָדָיו וְכִבֵּם וְהִתְנַלַּח, which belong to the first procedure.

washes his garments and is clean,⁹⁷ but if the priest sees that the *netek* has spread in the skin,⁹⁸ he is unclean.'

To this a later and quite superfluous corollary—forming an answer to the question, 'how about a *netek* that remains unchanged and a black hair springs up in it, i. e. hair of the natural colour?'—adds (ver. 37):

'If the *netek* remains the same and a black hair springs up in it, the *netek* is healed⁹⁹—he is clean.'¹⁰⁰

Now it will have become evident that in none of the five sections so far considered is there any reason to assume that we have variants of a particular disease known as *ṣāra'at*. The term when introduced in these sections has been shown to be a later addition, and is, moreover, taken in a generic sense as an 'unclean' skin trouble, and not as a designation of any specific disease. The same is the case with the two remaining sections—(6) vers. 38–39 and (7) vers. 40–44—before we reach the point where the thread of the original and genuine *ṣāra'at* legislation is again taken up. In fact, in the case of the sixth section the term *ṣāra'at* is not even introduced, and it is evident that this little section, consisting of only two verses without the

⁹⁷ See the preceding note.

⁹⁸ Ver. 35, 'If the *netek* has spread on the skin after his purification', is entirely superfluous, added in view of the erroneous combination of the two procedures. Ver. 36 a is a doublet to ver. 35 a.

⁹⁹ Comment, ver. 36, 'The priest need not (even) hunt for the shining hair', for it would make no difference in the decision that the victim is 'unclean'. The comment is an answer to the question, Why is nothing said of the shining hair in case the *netek* has spread?

¹⁰⁰ A superfluous comment or a misplaced gloss adds, 'and the priest declares him clean'. It is to be noted that in ver. 37, as in ver. 5, the phrase 'stands in his eyes' is used to express the idea that the mark is unchanged, as against the phrase in ver. 28 'stands under it', pointing again to the different editors or commentators from whom these additions and comments and answers to implied questions emanate.

amplification, as in the preceding five, is a supplement to verses 4-8 and 24-28 dealing with 'shining' marks in the skin. The text originally read:

'If a man or woman has shining marks¹⁰¹ on the skin¹⁰²—it is clean.'¹⁰³

The seventh section deals with baldness, and various kinds of bald spots, and certainly has nothing to do with the real *ṣāra'at*. In its original form the section read:

'If a man loses the hair of his head¹⁰⁴—he is clean. If there is a white mark¹⁰⁵ at the bald place,¹⁰⁶ and the priest sees that there is a white swelling mark,¹⁰⁷ the priest shall surely declare him unclean.'¹⁰⁸

¹⁰¹ A gloss adds 'shining white marks'.

¹⁰² The first part of ver. 39, 'And the priest sees the shining spots' (gloss, 'faint white marks'), is a 'Gemara' to point out that the priest is the one who must determine the harmless character of the spots.

¹⁰³ Explanatory comment, 'It is a tetter (*bōhaḥ*) that has broken out on the skin'. On *bōhaḥ* corresponding to the modern Syriac *bahaḥ*, see the note on p. 76 of Driver's Book of Leviticus in the Polychrome Bible, ed. Haupt.

¹⁰⁴ Comment, 'he is a bald person' (פֶּרֶחַ). To this ver. 41, in the nature of a Gemara, adds, 'If the front part of his head is bald he is forehead bald (פֶּרֶחַ), he is unclean'.

¹⁰⁵ Additions, (a) 'reddish', like ver. 19, &c. See notes 74 and 83.

¹⁰⁶ Addition, in view of ver. 41, 'or at the forehead baldness'. There follows the further comment, as in the above discussed five sections, 'it is *ṣāra'at*', to which some other commentator adds 'in his baldness' or 'his forehead baldness' (i. e. 'a *ṣāra'at* of his baldness or of his forehead baldness'), again in view of ver. 41. The Hebrew text also has 'breaking out' (פֶּרֶחַת הָיָא); but the Greek properly omits this, which is clearly added in view of the addition 'breaking out' in ver. 39. See notes 120 and 121.

¹⁰⁷ שֵׁאֲת־הִנֵּנִי לְבָנָה, to which again are added (a) 'reddish' and (b) 'in his baldness or forehead baldness'.

¹⁰⁸ No less than four further comments are added: (1) 'like the appearance of *ṣāra'at* of the skin of the flesh' (עוֹר בְּשָׁר) harking back to vers. 2-3; (2) אִישׁ צָרוּעַ הוּא 'he is a man afflicted with *ṣāra'at*', where the combination of 'man' with *ṣārū'a*, as against *ṣārū'a* alone in ver. 45 (forming part of the original *ṣāra'at* legislation), points to the artificial addition;

The result, therefore, of our investigations so far has been to show that none of the symptoms detailed in the seven sections superimposed upon the original *ṣāra'at* legislation have anything to do with the disease described in the original portion of the two chapters, and that these superimposed sections are to be regarded merely as an index of that natural tendency to differentiate among a large variety of skin troubles due in part to advancing medical knowledge—though medicine in a primitive state—and in part to the interest, partly practical, partly theoretical, in legal enactments, prompting questions to which answers must be given, and suggesting legal niceties that need to be discussed—a process in short, that, as has been emphasized above, is of the same general character as that to be noted in the great compilation of Rabbinical Judaism, and which led to the growth of an enormous Gemara about a comparatively simple series of enactments grouped together as Mishnah.

This process is continued and carried still further in the two sections of Lev. 13 and 14 that still remain to be discussed: (8) Lev. 13. 47-58, regarding suspicious spots or marks on garments and stuffs; (9) Lev. 14. 33-47, to which verses 48-53, a cleansing ritual corresponding to 14. 4-7 is attached.

(3) *וְהָיָה כִּי יִהְיֶה* 'he is unclean', quite superfluous, and added merely as a conventional phrase; (4) 'His mark is on his head', again in the style of a 'Gemara' in answer to the question, Can *nega'* be applied to the head as to the rest of the body? The first comment is in the nature of an explanation of the phrase 'a white swelling mark', to suggest a comparison with the diagnosis of the 'white swelling' (ver. 10), and on the erroneous assumption, prompted by the conventional addition of *ṣāra'at* throughout these sections, that all these skin troubles are forms of a specific *ṣāra'at* disease.

Taking up the former, the use of the term *nega' šāra'at* (vers. 47, 49, (or *šāra'at*) 51, 52) for such spots on garments and stuffs is a further proof, if one were still needed, that *šāra'at* had lost any specific meaning that it may once have possessed, for such a thing as 'leprosy', or any disease peculiar to man, is a manifest absurdity in the case of garments or stuffs. The reference must be to moulds of some kind or other. Moreover, as in other sections, נִגַע צִרְעָתָה alternates with נִגַע and צִרְעָתָה, the fuller or the abbreviated expression being synonymously used for a mark that is suspicious or unclean. The section shows distinct traces of dependence upon the original *šāra'at* legislation,¹⁰⁹ and represents, therefore, the further natural extension of the general subject of marks or spots outside of the human body. Just as in the other sections, we are here also in a position to separate the original portion from subsequent accretions, again offering analogies to the 'Gemara' superimposed upon the 'Mishnah'. The section begins:

'If there is a mark¹¹⁰ on a garment, and the mark is greenish or reddish,¹¹¹ the priest shall see the mark and

¹⁰⁹ e. g. in the shutting up of the suspected garment, &c., for seven days; in the diagnosis, whether the mark has spread or remained steadfast; in the washing of the garment, corresponding to the washing of the body and the shaving of the head.

¹¹⁰ Text, נִגַע צִרְעָתָה, where, however, צִרְעָתָה is an erroneous addition, as shown by the consistent use of נִגַע alone in the portion of the following verses dealing with the merely suspected mark. It is only in case the mark by the test is proved to be unclean that the word *šāra'at* can properly be added. There is added (a) the explanatory Gemara 'in a garment of wool or in a garment of flax', and then (b) the further amplification in answer to the questions, How if it appears in the warp or in the woof only? Does this apply also to wool and flax? How if it appears on a prepared skin, i. e. leather or on something made of a skin? The answer is, 'or in the warp or in the woof of wool or flax [so the Greek text], or in a skin or in anything made of skin'.

¹¹¹ 'Greenish' may be a later addition, since in the other sections 'reddish

shut up the mark for seven days. If the priest¹¹² sees on the seventh day that the mark has spread on the garment,¹¹³ the mark is unclean; and he shall burn the garment¹¹⁴ in which is the mark;¹¹⁵ but if the priest sees that the mark has not spread in the garment,¹¹⁶ the priest shall command to wash¹¹⁷ the (part) where the mark is,¹¹⁸ and the priest shall inspect the mark after it has been washed, and if the mark has not altered its appearance¹¹⁹—it is unclean.¹²⁰

alone is introduced. Once more the addition, 'or in a skin, or in the warp or in the woof, or in any object made of a skin'. Then follow the two further additions, (1) 'it is a *šāra'at* mark', as in the preceding sections, and (2) 'it shall be shown to the priest'.

¹¹² So the Greek text.

¹¹³ Two comments, (a) the customary addition 'or in the warp, or in the woof, or in a skin, including whatsoever is made of the skin', and (b) *צִרְעָת מְאֵרָה*, meaning probably 'persistent *šāra'at*', corresponding to 'chronic *šāra'at*' (ver. 11).

¹¹⁴ Again, 'or in the warp, or in the woof, in the flax or the wool or any object made of skin'. The variations in this conventional addition, such as the omission of the 'skin', the change in the order of enumeration, the variant usage to indicate anything made of leather, clearly point to the supplementary character of the insertions.

¹¹⁵ Explanatory comment, 'because it is a "persistent" mark it shall be burnt in the fire'.

¹¹⁶ 'Or in the warp, or in the woof, or in any object made of skin.'

¹¹⁷ Hebrew text plural (*וַיִּבְשֹׁמוּ*), whereas the Greek text has the singular.

¹¹⁸ At this point the original text has been more seriously interfered with by the addition of a second period of seven days' observation, added evidently to bring about a correspondence with Lev. 13. 5, where, however, the point is that the mark has remained steady. The ordinance, in its original form, prescribed the washing of the spot as a further test.

¹¹⁹ Explanatory comment, 'though the mark has not spread'.

¹²⁰ Two additions, (1) 'in the fire thou shalt burn it' (note the variant usage), and (2) it is a *pešetet* (*פֶּשֶׁתֶּת*), which, according to the tenor of the Greek rendering (*ἐσθρῖζεται*), designates 'a deeply ingrained mark'. The further addition, (3) 'in its baldness or its forehead baldness', is evidently a misplaced addition belonging somewhere in the seventh section (vers. 40-44). It is strange that none of recent commentators, neither Driver, nor Carpenter, nor Baentsch, nor Bertholet, has noticed this. The Greek version reads

But if the priest sees that the mark has grown faint after the mark has been washed, he shall tear it out of the garment,¹²¹ and the garment¹²² which has been washed, and from which the mark has disappeared,¹²³ it is clean.' The beginning of ver. 59, 'This is the *torah* of the *šāra'at* mark', belongs, as clearly indicated, to the original *šāra'at* legislation, to which a final redactor who had merely this eighth section before him, and which must have once occupied an independent position, added, 'a garment of wool or flax, or the warp or the woof, or any object of skin, with reference to its being clean or its being unclean'.

Taking up, finally, the ninth section (Lev. 14. 33-53) we have its originally independent character (as has been recognized by commentators)¹²⁴ indicated by the special introductory clause: 'When you come to the land of Canaan, which I give you as an inheritance,¹²⁵ and I put

'in the garment, or in the warp, or in the woof', which is at least intelligible. 'Baldness' and 'Forehead baldness' become, of course, nonsensical when applied to garments. The entire gloss, *פִּחְחֶתָּהּ הִיא בְּקֶרְחָתָהּ אוֹ בְּנִבְחָתָהּ*, is a variant of ver. 42 b, and *פִּחְחֶתָּהּ* may be simply a corruption for *פִּרְחֶתָּהּ* in ver. 42.

¹²¹ Addition, 'or from the skin, or from the warp, or from the woof'. The entire fifty-seventh verse represents a group of additional comments, as follows: (a) 'If it should reappear in the garment, or in the warp, or in the woof, or in any object of skin, it is a spreading mark' (*פִּרְחֶתָּהּ*); (b) 'In the fire thou shalt burn it'; (c) 'where the mark is', the latter again a misplaced comment.

¹²² Addition, 'or the warp, or the woof, or any object of skin'.

¹²³ Explanatory comment harking back to the addition in ver. 54 (see note 118), 'and washed a second time'.

¹²⁴ See, e.g., Carpenter and Battersby, *Hexateuch*, II, p. 162, note 33; Baentsch, p. 374; Driver, *Leviticus*, p. 77, note 22, &c.

¹²⁵ A similar phrase in Lev. 19. 23; 25. 2 and Num. 15. 2 marks the introduction of an independent little Torah and, as it would appear, either

a mark¹²⁶ in a house,¹²⁷ and the one to whom the house belongs comes and tells the priest, to wit: "something like a mark has appeared in my house". Then follows (ver. 36) a curious provision, that before the priest comes the house is to be cleared of the furniture so as to save that from also being pronounced unclean. This practical device, which shows that questions of sanitation could not have been uppermost in the minds at least of those who commented upon the legislation, looks very much again like an answer to the question whether one may remove one's furniture before the mark is examined, and thus save it from possible destruction in case the whole house is condemned. At all events, verse 35 must be joined directly to verse 37.

'And when the priest sees that the mark¹²⁸ on the walls of the house forms greenish¹²⁹ or reddish patches, and that they are deeper than the wall, then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house,¹³⁰ and close up the house for seven days; and the priest shall return on the seventh day, and if he sees that the mark has spread on the walls of the house, the priest shall order the stones where the mark appears to be removed, and to be thrown

of a supplementary character, as in our case, and in Lev. 19. 23 and 25. 2, or in the nature of a general summary, as Num. 15. 2. In all cases the legislation thus introduced is late, representing, in fact, the latest stratum in the Priestly Code.

¹²⁶ Text, נִיּוֹץ צִרְעָת, but here again, as Lev. 13. 47, *ṣāra'at* is out of place, and anticipates the result of the diagnosis.

¹²⁷ Addition, 'of the land of your possession'; Greek versions read 'houses'.

¹²⁸ The Hebrew has a superfluous 'and behold the *nega'*', which is omitted in the Greek version.

¹²⁹ 'Greenish' may be a later addition. See note III.

¹³⁰ Note the discursive style, characteristic of this ninth section.

outside the city,¹³¹ and other stones to be taken and brought in place of the stones.¹³² And if the mark reappears and spreads on the house after he has removed the stones,¹³³ then if the priest comes and sees that the mark has spread in the house¹³⁴—it is unclean. And one shall tear down the house,¹³⁵ and all the dust shall be carried outside of the city.¹³⁶ But if the priest comes and sees that the mark has not spread in the house, the priest shall declare the house clean, for the mark is healed.¹³⁷

Here the first part of the section ends, and there follow (vers. 49–53) the ritualistic provisions which are manifestly a transference of Lev. 14. 4–8 a—the first procedure in the

¹³¹ Addition, 'to an unclean place', which suggests the unsanitary dust and rubbish heaps characteristic of Palestinian towns even at the present time. A 'Gemara' adds (ver. 41) 'And the house shall be scraped all around, and the scraped dust deposited outside of the city at an unclean place'.

¹³² Addition, 'And he shall take other dust, and plaster the house', in answer to the question, What is to be done to the house?

¹³³ Addition to conform to the earlier additions, 'And after the house has been scraped, and after the plastering'.

¹³⁴ Addition as in the former section, 'It is "persistent" *ṣāra'at* in the house'. Cf. note 115.

¹³⁵ Addition, 'Its stones and its wood', a detailed specification added in answer to the question, Does 'house' mean perhaps only the stone, or does it include the wood-work? The Greek version omits 'its wood', pointing clearly to the manipulation of the Hebrew text.

¹³⁶ Addition again 'to an unclean place'. Then follow two purely ritualistic ordinances, which clearly represent the endeavour to connect a ritualistic observance with the 'house' spot as with other kinds of marks. Therefore, we are told (vers. 46–7), 'And whoever enters the house during the days that it is closed shall be unclean till evening; and he who sleeps in the house shall wash his garments ['and be unclean till evening', so the Greek text]; and he who eats in the house shall wash his garments ['and be unclean till evening', so again the Greek text]. Verse 47 evidently represents the superstructure upon ver. 46 to bring about a conformity with Lev. 14. 8 and with passages like ver. 9 based thereon.

¹³⁷ **וְהָיָה כִּי יִרְאֶה הַכֹּהֵן**, corresponding to Lev. 14. 3 in the original *ṣāra'at* Torah.

original *šāra'at* Torah—to the 'house' mark, and a most awkward transfer at that, as will presently appear. Before taking up this second part, let us note how in the first part the diagnosis follows slavishly in the path of the original *šāra'at* legislation in the following points: (1) the emphasis on the change of colour at the place where the mark is; (2) that the mark or marks must be beneath the surface; (3) the seven days' quarantine; (4) the decisions resting upon the spread of the mark. The new point, though corresponding in a measure to the tearing out of the mark on the garment (Lev. 13. 56), is the removal of the stones containing the suspicious marks (to which later commentators added still further directions). Here, evidently, we have a piece of legislation specially devised for the case in question, and not based upon an attempt to provide in the case of the mark on the house something analogous to an unclean mark on an individual. The same applies to the provision to tear down the house and to remove the dust to another place in case of a reappearance, or of a spread of the marks after the first attempt to heal the house had failed.

Taking up the second part of the section, the dependence upon Lev. 14. 4-8 a, as has already been suggested, is self-evident. The adaptation of the latter ritual in its elaborated and not in its original form to the house declared clean, leads to the substitution of the interesting phrase לְהַסֵּחַ,¹³⁸ literally, 'to remove the sin' (Lev. 14. 49 and 52), in the sense of purifying—what we would call 'fumigating'—for לְמַסַּח 'to declare or dismiss as clean' (14. 4, 7). The

¹³⁸ The Piel of the verb in this sense is found in Exod. 29, 36; Lev. 8. 15; 9. 15; Ezek. 43. 22-23, applied to the altar; also Ps. 51. 9 in the direct sense of cleansing; but quite differently Gen. 31. 39.

comparison between Lev. 14. 4-8 with 49-53, moreover, justifies the analysis given of the former, since some of the additions in Lev. 14. 4-8 are actually not found in 49-53. So we have in the latter merely 'the two birds' without the addition of 'living clean'. Similarly, verse 51 is nearer to the original form than 14. 4, especially in the Greek text, which reads:

'And he shall take [addition: "cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet thread"] the living bird and dip it [so the Greek text] in the blood of the killed one [addition: the running water"—so the Greek text] and sprinkle¹³⁹ the house seven times.'

Verse 50 corresponds to verse 5, but on the other hand, verse 52 represents a redundancy over the original *šāra'at* Torah. It sums up:

'And he shall purge¹⁴⁰ the house through the blood of the bird, and through the running water, and through the living bird, and through the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet thread.' This is evidently added to emphasize the elaborateness of the ritual. Verse 53 reading: 'And he shall send off the living bird outside of the city¹⁴¹ and atone for the house,'¹⁴² corresponds to the second part of verse 7. The substitution of 'city' for 'field' indicates the change in social conditions intervening between the period of the original *šāra'at* Torah and the late supplement modelled upon it. It is perhaps worth while to note that the second ritual (vers. 8 b-20) is not

¹³⁹ Greek text adds 'with them'.

¹⁴⁰ מִצְוָה, see note 138.

¹⁴¹ The dependence of this ritualistic ordinance upon Lev. 14. 4-8 a is shown by the meaningless addition of 'over the face of the field', merely because this phrase is used in Lev. 14. 7.

¹⁴² Addition, 'and it is clean'.

carried over to the 'cleansing' ritual for the house. The older exorcising ceremony alone was adapted to the case of a 'mark' in a house, and that after the test had been made and the house declared clean. In view of this adaptation it is no longer possible to say whether in the case also of the house, the ritual originally represented the means of exorcising the disease, and was subsequently connected with a symbolical ceremony of formally declaring the house clean. The lateness of this transferred ritual suggests that in the mind of the one who so transferred it, the ritual was regarded merely as a 'dismissal' ceremony.

The subscript, verses 54-57, is particularly elaborate. As already pointed out, we may regard the second half of verse 57, 'This is the law of the *ṣāra'at*'—as the closing formula of the original *ṣāra'at* legislation. If this be so, it will be the simplest solution of the problem to divide the remaining verses into a series of originally independent subscripts that have been here repeated and united. In this way verse 54, 'This is the law for every *nega' ṣāra'at*, and for the *netek*', would be the subscript for Lev. 13. 1-17 and 29-37; [This is the law for the *ṣāra'at*] 'of the garment' (ver. 55 a) for Lev. 13. 47-58; '[This is the law for the *ṣāra'at*] of the house' (ver. 55 b) for Lev. 14. 33-53, while verse 56, 'for the swelling, growth, and shining spot' (taken from Lev. 13. 2), represents an amplification to verse 54—and is, therefore, a comment or note which has gotten a little out of place. Of special interest is verse 57 a, 'to teach [i.e. to set forth the law] for the day of (pronouncing) unclean and for the day of (pronouncing) clean', which again is obviously a 'Gemara' to explain that the Torah includes the diagnosis and the decision—whether unclean or clean. The subscript through the

repetition and the union of five subscripts: (1) all kinds of *nega' šāra'at* [i.e. the swelling, growth, and shining spot]; (2) *netek*; (3) garment; (4) house; and (5) that of the original legislation¹⁴³ thus aims to unite the two chapters that we have analysed into one Torah—viewed under the aspect of *šāra'at*, but we have seen that this term, representing everywhere outside of the *original šāra'at* legislation an addition, is used in the generic sense of any unclean spot or mark on a human body, or on a garment, or on a stuff, or on a house. We must, therefore, exclude the nine sections superimposed upon the original legislation from consideration in any attempt to determine what the *šāra'at* really and originally meant.

V

It is needless for our purpose to enter into a detailed discussion of the various views regarding *šāra'at* that have been brought forward from a medical point of view.¹⁴⁴ All of these investigations, valuable though they are as medical discussions, suffer from the defect that they assume the unity of Lev. 13 and 14,¹⁴⁵ and particularly of Lev. 13. 1–37,

¹⁴³ It will be observed that there is no subscript for the section on boils or burns (Lev. 13. 18–28), or for the one on baldness (Lev. 13. 40–4), which raises the question whether these sections may not have been inserted *after* the first union of Lev. 13 and 14.

¹⁴⁴ It is sufficient to refer to G. N. Münch, *Die Zaraath (Lepra) der hebräischen Bibel*, Hamburg, 1893 (with full bibliographical references); R. Bennett, *The Diseases of the Bible*, London, 1891, chap. I; Ebstein, *Die Medizin im Alten Testament*, pp. 75–95; Preuss, *Biblisch-Talmudische Medizin*, pp. 369–90; and Jay F. Schamberg, *The Nature of the Leprosy of the Bible* (see note 2). Some of these writers, especially Ebstein (l. c., p. 89), recognize that *šara'at* includes a variety of skin diseases.

¹⁴⁵ It was, of course, natural that ancient writers like Philo and the rabbinical authorities in the Talmud, under the ban of the tradition which ascribed the entire Pentateuchal legislation to one period and one man,

which portion naturally occupies the most prominent place in medical discussions of *ṣāra'at*. The above analysis has, however, shown that verses 18–37 deal with boils, burns, and sores, and their symptoms, and that they are pronounced clean or unclean according to tests that are suggested by, and dependent upon, those applied to *ṣāra'at* in the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, but that otherwise they have nothing to do with *ṣāra'at*. The application of the term *ṣāra'at* to these diseases represents a late addition made at a time when *ṣāra'at* had acquired an entirely general designation, so that it could be applied even to 'bald spots' (Lev. 13. 42). The fact that the diseases mentioned in Lev. 13. 17–37 have their specific designation as 'boils', 'burns', and particularly *netek*, and that even the symptoms described have technical designations ('scab of boil', 'scab of burn') strengthens the thesis that the application of *ṣāra'at* to them is of secondary origin; and this is further borne out by the substitution of *nega'* for *ṣāra'at*, to which attention has been directed. In Lev. 13. 1–17 the 'growth' (תפחת *sappahat*) has its specific name, namely, *mispahat* (תפחת *mispahat* vers. 6–8), which if it spreads does not become *ṣāra'at*, but makes one unclean. In the case of *mispahat* it is particularly clear that the application of *ṣāra'at* has no medical significance or justification—the point involved being to determine whether it is a 'clean' or an 'unclean' variety of disease. The addition at the close of ver. 8, 'it is *ṣāra'at*', can only have the force of a convention—a non-medical identification, should have started from this point of view, which led Philo (*de Posteritate Caini*, I, § 13) to define *ṣāra'at* as a 'multiform and complicated disease', and the Rabbis in the Talmudical Treatise *Nega'im* to go to even greater lengths in the application of a term that must once have had a very specific meaning.

and at the very most can be taken to mean that the 'unclean' *mispaḥat* is to be put on the same plane as *ṣāra'at*. In a medical discussion, therefore, it is erroneous to start from an identification of the two, or to regard *mispaḥat* as a variety of *ṣāra'at*. This view of *sappaḥat* carries with it *baheret* (shining mark), which is treated merely as a symptom, and therefore introduced with *sappaḥat* (ver. 4), with boils (ver. 19), and with burns (vers. 24, 28), and with *bōhaḳ* (ver. 39). On the other hand, 'the white swelling' implied in ver. 2, and treated in ver. 10—a part of the original *ṣāra'at* legislation—belongs to the symptoms of *ṣāra'at*, and apparently is the means, or one of the means, of distinguishing between ordinary *ṣāra'at*, which may be healed, and chronic *ṣāra'at*, which is pronounced unclean even without the test of an isolation for purposes of observation (ver. 11).

In verses 38–9 the description of a specific disease *bōhaḳ* (tetter) is given as a caution against regarding numerous white spots on the skin as 'unclean'. The term *ṣāra'at* is not even introduced here—the verdict being 'clean'—while in verses 40–43, dealing with two forms of baldness, the occurrence of 'white swelling', alone suggests a comparison with the diagnosis of *ṣāra'at*. While, no doubt, this section is secondary to the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, the possibility that the symptom here described may belong to *ṣāra'at* in the original sense must be admitted. The peculiar usage, 'like the appearance of a *ṣāra'at* of the skin of the flesh' (Lev. 13. 43), shows, at all events, the intention of the author to add this symptom under the head of the genuine *ṣāra'at*. Even though not belonging to the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, verse 43 must be considered in a discussion of the original force of *ṣāra'at*.

We may, of course, dismiss without a further word the application of *šāra'at* to garments, stuffs, and houses—which if taken seriously would lead to medical conclusions of an absurd character. Even those who wish to save the *original* integrity of Lev. 13 and 14 will hardly go so far as to assume that the legislator had in mind the modern 'germ' theory, according to which a disease can be carried to a person through clothes or through the walls of a house. Such germs—difficult often for modern medical science to determine—are not so considerate as to manifest themselves in big patches. The non-scientific application of the name of a disease to which man is subject to an inanimate object shows conclusively that *šāra'at* is not used in its specific and original sense.

Excluding, therefore, *mispahat*, as well as 'boils', 'burns', *netek* (open sore), *bōhak* (tetter), and, of course, mere baldness and marks on garments and stuffs and houses, what then is *šāra'at*?

Thrown back upon the original *šāra'at* legislation, the answer, from a symptomatic point of view, is quite simple. It is a skin disease, which appears in a milder and curable form, and in a severer chronic form—or what was considered at the time as chronic. In its milder form the symptoms are a spot (or a mark) with a tendency to spread,¹⁴⁶ appearing deeper than the skin, and changing the hair at the spot to white; the other as the chronic form is marked by the 'swelling' character of the spot, i.e. the inflammation produces a spot in 'high-relief' as against 'bas-relief'. Besides, there is also the symptom of the hair at the spot turning white, and the appearance of raw flesh in the

¹⁴⁶ Note, however, the 'Gemara' (ver. 12) that if it spreads over the whole body it is merely a 'rash', and, therefore, 'clean'.

swelling. From a modern medical point of view, these symptoms must appear somewhat naïve and decidedly insufficient. It is not surprising that students of medicine should disagree as to the precise disease indicated, and that the perfectly relevant question should have been raised whether *ṣāra'at* ever indicated any specific disease.

That *ṣāra'at* was never intended as a designation of leprosy or *elephantiasis Graecorum*¹⁴⁷ is now so generally admitted as to require no further discussion. Indeed, there is no proof that the disease was known in Palestine in early days any more than in Egypt or in other parts of the near Orient.¹⁴⁸ The consistent Greek rendering of *ṣāra'at* as *lepra*—followed by the Vulgate—is a most valuable tradition, carrying us back to at least the second century B.C., for the current view of *ṣāra'at*, just as a misunderstanding of *lepra* is responsible for the opinion still popularly current that the disease described as *ṣāra'at* is leprosy. The manner in which the confusion between *lepra* and 'leprosy' arose is fully set forth by Bennett and others.¹⁴⁹ In Greek medical usage *lepra* designates 'a cutaneous disease varying in its features, but the essential characteristic of which is a rough, scabrous or scaly eruption on the skin, with more or less evidence of surrounding redness or superficial inflammation.'¹⁵⁰ Three varieties of *lepra* are distinguished by Greek writers, and it is therefore reasonable to suppose

¹⁴⁷ See, especially, Münch's exhaustive discussion of the point, chaps. I and III-VI, and Bennett's *Diseases of the Bible*, pp. 40 ff.

¹⁴⁸ So, e. g., Münch's conclusion, p. 145. If it had been known, it would certainly have been enumerated among the diseases threatened as 'curses' in Deut. 28, where it is noticeable that *ṣāra'at* is not mentioned, whereas the 'boils' of Egypt (*ṣeḥīm*) (ver. 27) are included.

¹⁴⁹ See Bennett, pp. 16-19; Münch, pp. 88 ff.

¹⁵⁰ Bennett, p. 19.

that several varieties also existed in Palestine. Curiously enough—if the above analysis is correct—there would be also three varieties in Lev. 13. 1-17: (1) the 'bas-relief' *šāra'at*; (2) the 'high-relief' *šāra'at*; and (3) the *mispahat*, which latter certainly stands in a close relation to the first and second. In any case *šāra'at* is definitely narrowed down to this portion of the chapter—'boils', 'burns', *netek*, *bōhak*, &c., being entirely excluded. Too much stress must not be laid upon this quite unexpected result that Lev. 13. 1-17 should contain three varieties of *šāra'at*, for the agreement with the three varieties recognized by Greek medical writers may be a pure coincidence, and would have a value only in case the diagnosis of the three varieties would be identical among Greeks and Hebrews.¹⁵¹ This does not appear to be the case. The essential characteristic of *lepra* seems to be, according to the testimony of Greek and Latin medical writers,¹⁵² scabrous or scaly eruptions on the

¹⁵¹ This suggestion that three varieties of *lepra* are described, corresponding to the three varieties of *vittiligo* as set up by Celsus, was made long ago (see Bennett, pp. 31-3) by Drs. Mason, Good, and Belcher, but their identifications are very arbitrary, and rest upon the erroneous supposition that all diseases enumerated in Lev. 13 come under *šāra'at*. Moreover, the fact that the same three designations (*alphos*, *melas*, and *leukē*) are described as varieties of *vittiligo* by Celsus (*de Medicina*, V, 27. 19), whereas writers apply the three terms to varieties of *lepra* (*psoriasis*), or to diseases allied to *lepra*, points to a further confusion in early medical nomenclature, which an additional warning against drawing definite conclusions from the vague and unscientific diagnosis in Lev. 13.

¹⁵² See the passages from Hippocrates gathered by Münch, *Die Zazaath (Lepra) der Bibel*, pp. 3-4. Since Hippocrates used the plural form, *leprai* (cf. 'certain leprai', V, 98, § 17, ed. Littré), it is evident that he recognized several varieties, but it is to be noted that he nowhere enumerates three varieties, *alphos*, *melas*, and *leukē*. In fact, *melas* is not mentioned by him at all, whereas *alphos* (also used in the plural as well as in the singular) occurs by the side of *lepra*, but distinct from it (*lepra*, *leichenēs*, and *alphoi*, V, 701, § 502; *lepra* and *alphos*, V, p. 179; IX, 105, § 20, &c.), and the same

skin as the name *lepra*, which means 'rough' or 'scaly', indicates. The three varieties, *alphos*, *melas*, *leukē* are distinguished from one another by the colour of the eruption, which in the case of *alphos* is white, in the case of *melas* black and shadowy, and in the case of *leukē* whiter than the *alphos* variety. Moreover, only in the case of the *leukē*, is there in Celsus a specific mention of white hairs in connexion with the eruption. The *leukē* penetrates more deeply into the skin than the *alphos* and *melas*, which agree—except in the matter of the colour—'in being roughish and not confluent, looking as though scattered in drops with wide interspaces between the drops'.¹⁵³ By general consent, the *lepra* of the Greeks is identified with *psoriasis*, or at all events, the different varieties of *lepra* are classed under the head of *psoriasis*. The important stress which is laid upon the hair turning white in Lev. 13, suggests that the only form of *lepra* which the original *ṣāra'at* legislators had in mind was the *leukē* variety, and the description given in verse 3 of the appearance of the mark 'deeper than the skin' might accord also with the express mention in the case of *leukē* that the eruption penetrates more deeply into the skin. It is noticeable also that the *leukē* variety is the only one of the three which has a serious import, and was on the whole not regarded as curable, whereas the *alphos* and *melas* are cured without great difficulty. The objection, however, against the identification of *ṣāra'at* in Lev. 13. 3 with *leukē* is that no

is the case with *leukē* (*leichenēs*, *leprai*, and *leukai* (plural), IX, p. 75, § 43). There is, in fact, no passage where even *lepra*, *leukē*, and *alphos* occur together, showing that each was regarded as a distinct disease by Hippocrates, and that in the case of each, as the use of the plural form shows, several varieties were recognized.

¹⁵³ Bennett, as above note 149.

reference is made to the rough or scaly symptom of the eruption. Such a reference may, however, be recognized in the second variety of *šāra'at* (ver. 10) where the eruption is in 'high relief'. The 'white swelling' would be a close approach to *leukē*, and the 'raw flesh', added as another symptom, might well be a further description of a 'rough' eruption. The description of *leukē* that it 'penetrates more deeply' would, therefore, not represent the equivalent to being 'deeper than the skin', and this is perhaps natural, since in the case of *lepra* the eruptions are rough and scaly in all three varieties. The omission, therefore, of 'deeper than the skin', in ver. 10, adds strength to the view, here set forth, that *se'ēt* (סֵעִית) refers to a 'high relief' or a 'rough' eruption—'raising' the skin as it were. The absence of any reference to a 'rough eruption' in the case of the first variety of *šāra'at*, and the emphasis upon its being on the contrary, 'deeper than the skin', suggests an identification with the skin disease *vittiligo*, which—common in tropical countries—is 'characterized by bright white spots, the hairs of which lose their colour and become white'.¹⁰⁴ In the description of this first variety of *šāra'at* the stress is laid upon the hair at the spot turning 'white', and the expression 'deeper than the skin' would be a natural way of describing a spot that seems to be *in* the skin, in contrast to an eruption that appears *over* the skin. The addition represented by verse 4, where the phrase 'shining white' spot is introduced, suggests, by implication, that in verse 3, the *negā'* is white and shining, since the point in verse 4 is that the spot is not clearly defined as *in* the skin, i.e. too faint as yet to be recognized as such,

¹⁰⁴ Schamberg, *l. c.*, p. 4, of reprint from *Phil. Polyclinic*, vol. VII, Nov. 19-26, = *Biblical World*, 1899, p. 163.

and that the hair has not turned white. The conclusion thus reached, and which is here submitted to students of medicine, is that the Biblical *šāra'at* in the original form of the *šāra'at* Torah consists of two varieties, and that these two varieties represent a confusion of two distinct skin diseases: the first variety, regarded as less serious, while rendering the victim for the time being 'unclean', is *vittiligo*; the second variety, characterized as *chronic šāra'at* (Lev. 13. 11), is the *leukē* or the most serious variety of *lepra* or *psoriasis*. Verses 6-8, forming a later addition, would represent a further attempt to differentiate the *leukē* from other varieties, and the emphasis laid upon its 'being faint', in verse 6, naturally suggests a description of *alphos*, in which case the white colour of the eruption is not as pronounced.¹⁵⁵ Lastly, verses 12-13 representing again another addition for purposes of further differentiation, and describing marks which spread over the whole body, 'turning it all white', as the gloss in verse 13 explains, would represent a form of *vittiligo* in which the disease spreads until large areas of the body are involved, and even the entire body. Cases are on record of negroes affected by this disease turning entirely white.¹⁵⁶ The affection is an entirely harmless one, and in accord with this we find the verdict in Lev. 13. 14, 'he is clean'.

To sum up, then, we have two forms of genuine *šāra'at* in the original *šāra'at* legislation; one, the milder form, being a form of *vittiligo*, the other, the chronic form, being *leukē*. In the later additions to the original *šāra'at* section,

¹⁵⁵ Vers. 6-8 representing an addition to the original *šāra'at* legislation; naturally no special reference is made to the spot being a 'rising' eruption or a mark that appears on the skin.

¹⁵⁶ Schamberg, *l. c.*

we have (a) a form of *alphos* apparently described, which if it spreads is pronounced as 'unclean', and (b) a form of *vitaligo*, in which the whole flesh turns white, and which is pronounced 'clean'. In the balance of the chapter, Lev. 13, as well as in the additions to Lev. 14, represented by verses 33-47, the use of *ṣāra'at* is erroneous, or rather represents the later use of the term as a generic one—synonymous with *negā'*, 'mark'—to designate any kind of a spot, whether on any part of the human body, or on a garment, on a stuff, or on the walls of a house, which is regarded as 'unclean'. So far as 'marks' on a human being are concerned, Lev. 13. 18-43 includes boils and burns, open sores on the head or beard, baldness in various stages, and 'faint white spots' that form merely a tetter (*bōhaḳ*). Boils and burns that leave 'eruptions' (*se'ēt*), white or shining, or reddish, showing *symptoms* of the second variety of *ṣāra'at*, i. e. *leukē*, are unclean, whereas the mere scabs from boils or burns are clean. The sore (*neteḳ*) which shows the symptoms of the first variety of *ṣāra'at* (*lepra alphos*)—marks appearing to be in the skin and the hair turning yellowish—is unclean. Baldness and a mere tetter (*bōhaḳ*) finally are clean, but the appearance of an 'eruption' (*se'ēt*) on the bald spot raises the suspicion, according to what is probably a very late addition to the texts (ver. 42), of its being *ṣāra'at*, presumably of the second variety.

The oldest ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8 a, which in its original form, as has been shown, was a method of exorcising *ṣāra'at*, when it became a purification ritual performed at the time of healing, could have been applied only to the curable variety of *ṣāra'at*—i. e. to *vitaligo*, and, if we include the later addition to the legislation, also to *alphos*.

It was then naturally extended to all the other skin troubles mentioned in Lev. 13, which made the victim unclean until he was healed. On the other hand, the law of being excluded from human society, warning the people of one's approach by calling 'unclean', keeping one's mouth covered, allowing one's hair to grow long, not changing one's clothes—while applicable to all during the period of their being 'unclean', must have been devised originally for those who suffered from the 'chronic' and incurable variety of *lepra*, i. e. *leukē*. For those suffering from *vittiligo*, isolation outside of the camp until the demon had been exorcised, i. e. until the healing had taken place, was presumably all that was required.

We are now in a better position to consider the other passages in the Old Testament where *ṣāra'at* is mentioned. In accord with the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, the one so afflicted (Num. 5. 2, *ṣarūa'*) is to be removed from the camp, but the fact that he is mentioned together with one having a 'running' sore (נֶאֱרָא—also discussed in Lev. 15) indicates, not only that Num. 5 assumes the existence of Lev. 13–15, but also that the one who suffers from *ṣāra'at* is not necessarily a chronic or even a very serious sufferer. Deut. 24. 8 also assumes more or less detailed regulations regarding the *ṣāra'at*, and since verses 8 and 9 interrupt the order of subjects in this chapter, it may be safely assumed that we here have later insertions. Verse 9 is a reference to the punishment of Miriam with *ṣāra'at*, which is described Num. 12. 10–13.¹⁵⁷ If the phrase (ver. 10 b) 'and Miriam was stricken with *ṣāra'at* like snow' belongs

¹⁵⁷ Num. 12. 14–16 is a reference to Lev. 13. 4, though another disease, which seems to be 'jaundice', is indicated in ver. 14 a that is not mentioned in any of the codes.

to the original text, then we could say with reasonable certainty that the *ṣāra'at* in this case was of the first and milder variety—a form of *vittiligo*; but the words 'stricken with *ṣāra'at* like snow' (מְצֹרַעַת כְּשֶׁלֶג) seem to be quoted from Exod. 4. 6, and are therefore in all probability a gloss to the latter part of Num. 12. 10, 'And Aaron turned to Miriam and behold she was stricken with *ṣāra'at*'. To this a commentator added as an explanation the case of Exod. 4. 6, where the hand of Moses is described as becoming 'white as snow' (מְצֹרַעַת כְּשֶׁלֶג), and then is instantly restored to its normal condition—as one of the signs to be used by him in case he should meet with unbelief in his mission upon reaching Egypt. The reference to 'snow' in the case of Gehazi, the attendant of Elisha (2 Kings 5. 27) would seem to show that *vittiligo* was intended in this case which would, therefore, apply also to Naaman (2 Kings 5. 2), since it is the latter's disease which is transferred as a punishment for greed to Gehazi and his offspring (ver. 27). We may perhaps assume this also to be the case in 2 Kings 7. 3, though the text is vague in its tone. On the other hand, King Azariah (or Uzziah, as he is called in 2 Chron. 26) appears to have been smitten with the second and chronic variety of *ṣāra'at*, i. e. *leukē*, for he remains afflicted till his death, and is obliged to dwell in a separate house (2 Kings 15. 5; 2 Chron. 26. 21).¹⁵⁸

There is, of course, not the slightest reason for assuming that Job's sickness, or the one with which Hezekiah is smitten, represented any form of *ṣāra'at*, and much less leprosy. In both cases the disease is specified as 'boils'

¹⁵⁸ No special importance needs to be attached to the statement in 2 Chron. 26. 19, 20 that the *ṣāra'at* 'broke out on his forehead'.

(Isa. 38. 21 and Job 2. 7), just as in the case in one of the plagues of Egypt (Exod. 9. 10), where moreover the technical term *aba'bu'ot* (an Egyptian word?) is added. Indeed, it is noticeable in the large list of diseases which are threatened as a curse (Deut. 28) in case of a disobedience to the laws, that *ṣāra'at* is not mentioned, whereas 'boils'—specified as 'Egyptian boils'—are included (ver. 27) with others that are expressly declared to be 'incurable' ¹⁵⁹—a valuable indication that *ṣāra'at* after all was not counted among the most serious diseases, and that the special legislation is rather a reflex of the common occurrence of the disease in its two (or possibly more) varieties, which made it necessary to make provisions for those so stricken, and who were regarded as unclean merely because every *real* disease—due to demoniac possession—made the victim unclean. An affliction that was 'clean' was not *really* a disease, according to medical science in this primitive stage of empirical knowledge.

A question that should at least be touched upon at the close of this analysis is the one raised by Eerdmans's recent investigation of the entire book of Leviticus ¹⁶⁰ as to the age of the legislation in Lev. 13-14. With Eerdmans's general thesis that Leviticus, as in fact the whole of the

¹⁵⁹ The case of Job and Hezekiah are, therefore, exceptional, and are portrayed as miraculous through Divine intervention.

¹⁶⁰ *Alttestamentliche Studien*, IV, 'Das Buch Leviticus' (Giessen, 1912). See especially pp. 68-73. The grounds on which Wiener, *Origin of the Pentateuch*, p. 76, assumes an early origin for Lev. 13 and 14 do not seem to me to be of any value. In many points, especially when he pleads for the early character of many of the laws, Wiener is right, but he is not as 'original' as he thinks he is in his opposition to the critical school, and his method of argumentation, even where his conclusions are correct, is most defective, and sometimes unfair. I shall take up Wiener's contentions at some future time.

legislation in the Priestly Code, contains pre-exilic elements, I am in full accord. The analysis of Lev. 13-14, as set forth in this article, lends further support to Eerdmans's thesis, which as a matter of fact, has been held even by those who claimed post-exilic dates for the final form of the Priestly Code. It is evident that a purification ritual such as Lev. 14. 1-8 a, which contains distinct traces of having once been a method of exorcising a disease, must revert to a very ancient period; and even as a purification ritual it belongs to a time anterior to the period when a sacrifice of some kind was regarded as essential to a removal of 'uncleanness'. Indeed, the whole conception of disease as a state of 'uncleanness' belongs to the time when disease was supposed to be due to some 'unclean' demon that had found its way into one's body; and the 'uncleanness' at this stage of thought has nothing to do with hygienic impurity, as little as the demon theory of disease has anything to do with the modern germ theory of disease, albeit the former seems to suggest the latter. The references to the 'camp' and 'tent' in Lev. 14 also point to early social stages, and there is no reason to assume that these terms are introduced into a late legislation with a view of giving the impression that they are old, or in other words, as a deliberate invention to uphold a tradition of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuchal legislation. If such had been the deliberate intent of the compilers they would not have committed the inconsistency of introducing the word 'city' in the same chapter (Lev. 14. 40, 41, 45). The naïve and non-scientific manner of describing the two varieties of *ṣāra'at* and the almost total absence of technical terms in the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, with merely feeble attempts to differentiate two totally different

diseases, are further indications that point to an early, certainly to a pre-exilic origin, for the beginnings of the *ṣāra'at* legislation. Even the additions in Lev. 13. 1-43 may in large part belong to the pre-exilic period. This appears to be certainly the case with the additions to the first part of the chapter, Lev. 13. 1-18, with the possible exception of some glosses and of the general use of *ṣāra'at* for any unclean 'spot' on the skin, which I believe to be of comparatively late origin, while the supplementary sections, Lev. 13. 47-58, concerning spots on garments, &c., and certainly the still later section on spots on walls of houses, Lev. 14. 33-48, may, with great probability, be put down as post-exilic. This applies also to the ritualistic sections prescribing the sacrifice of animals as an integral part of the purification ceremonial, Lev. 14. 10-20, as well as to Lev. 14. 21-31, which is of the same character though possibly embodying, as above suggested,¹⁶¹ traces of an earlier and simpler sacrificial ritual. Naturally, the purification ritual attached to Lev. 14. 33-48 ('spots' on walls of houses), though taken over from the old and certainly pre-exilic ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8 a, forming part of the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, represents an addition that cannot be earlier than the section, Lev. 14. 33-48, itself.

As for the chronological sequence of the numerous sections superimposed upon the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, it seems safe to regard Lev. 14. 33-47, and the attached ritual, verses 48-53, as the latest additions made after the insertion of the sections in Lev. 13, i. e. verses 18-44, between the diagnosis of the two forms of *ṣāra'at* and the purification ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8 a; otherwise, the section of *ṣāra'at* marks on walls of houses would have found a place

¹⁶¹ See above, p. 379 f..

before or after the section, Lev. 13. 47-58, treating of marks on garments, &c. The absence of any ritual for the purification of marks on garments and stuffs would indicate an earlier date than the elaborate ritual, Lev. 14. 10-20, added to the second ritual, Lev. 14. 8 b-9, and superimposed upon the first ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8 a. This, of course, carries with it the later date for the 'substitute' sacrifice, Lev. 14. 21-31, though, as indicated, this may embody a simpler and, therefore, earlier 'sacrificial' ritual than the more complicated one. The order, therefore, would be: (1) Lev. 13. 47-58; (2) Lev. 14. 21-31; (3) Lev. 14. 10-20; (4) Lev. 14. 33-53. As for the remaining sections, the insertions in Lev. 13. 1-17 represent the earliest attempts at elaborating the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, while the five sections in Lev. 13. 18-44 may very well have been added in chronological sequence in the order in which the sections are now arranged. It is not, of course, possible to go further and specify any definite period at which the one or the other of these nine sections was added, beyond the general impression one receives from the larger use of technical terms (such as *netek*, *bōhak*, &c.) and the more detailed diagnosis in the case of 'boils' and 'burns', that the sections belong to a considerably advanced period of medical observation and are, therefore, presumably post-exilic. This would carry with it the four sections: (1) Lev. 13. 47-58; (2) Lev. 14. 21-31; (3) Lev. 14. 10-20; (4) Lev. 14. 33-53—all certainly later than the five sections—and the post-exilic character of which is suggested by internal evidence. I venture, therefore, to claim as pre-exilic not only the original *ṣāra'at* legislation and the original purification rituals, Lev. 14. 1-8 c and 8 b-9, but also the elaborated section, Lev. 13. 1-17, in which the additions are dovetailed into the original *ṣāra'at* portions.

Eerdmans,¹⁶² to be sure, would go much further and place the entire two chapters in the pre-exilic period, but his argumentation is not convincing because he underestimates the complicated character of the composition of Lev. 13-14. The fact, e.g., that the style and language of the section on marks in garments, &c. (Lev. 13. 47-59), agree with Lev. 13. 1-46 is due to direct imitation precludes its use as an argument for the unity of Lev. 13; and in the same way, Lev. 14. 33-53 ('marks' on walls of houses) imitates Lev. 13, and intentionally introduces so far as possible the same terms. Even if my analysis of Lev. 13-14 should not prove to be correct in all details, I feel safe in saying that the existence of an original *ṣāra'at* legislation consisting of Lev. 13. 2-3; 9-11 (with some additions), 45-6, and followed immediately by a 'purification' or 'dismissal' ritual, Lev. 14. 1-8 a, has been definitely demonstrated. No less significant is the fact that has been proved¹⁶³ of the distinction between a ritual performed outside of a sanctuary and one that is to be performed at an altar. This points not only to a very early age for the original *ṣāra'at* legislation, but also to a considerable interval of time between the age of the two rituals. Moreover, the 'sacrificial' ritual is based on a totally different point of view. The fact that provision is made for carrying out the later sacrificial ritual in Jerusalem only, without regard to occurrences of *ṣāra'at* in other parts of the country, is due, of course, to the theoretical basis of the Priestly Code that there is only one legislative centre at which sacrifice can be brought. Instead of concluding, as Eerdmans does, that the legislation originated in pre-exilic days in sole connexion with the sanctuary at Jerusalem, because a post-

¹⁶² *l. c.*, pp. 38-73.

¹⁶³ See above, p. 375.

exilic legislation would necessarily have regard to Jewish settlements outside of the capital, the more obvious deduction would be that the Priestly Code is to a large extent an 'ideal' compilation made with the express purpose of adapting the older and younger practices to a theoretical centre. That animal sacrifices were brought in pre-exilic days, and at a very early period must, of course, be admitted, and the emphasis on the 'tent of meeting' in the ritual of Lev. 14. 10-31 may be taken as an indication that the basis of the ritual is pre-exilic, but the frequent substitution of 'before Jahweh' in the section would have no meaning unless one assumed that it represents the endeavour again to apply older practices—considerably elaborated and transferred to Jahweh's one and only legitimate sanctuary at Jerusalem; so that we are once more brought face to face with the distinctly post-exilic ideal that underlies the legislation of the Priestly Code in its present form. It is characteristic of the gradual growth of legislation to retain in a conservative spirit the language and the form of earlier legislation, even when inconsistent with later conditions. Just as laws are never *actually* abrogated in ancient codes, but carried along with modifications that at times totally change the character of ancient statutes even to the point of virtually abrogating them,¹⁶⁴ so formulas are carried over and given a new interpretation through glosses or explanatory comments. The substitution of 'before Jahweh'

¹⁶⁴ A good case in point is the legislation regarding slaves, in the so-called Book of the Covenant, Exod. 21. 1-6, which theoretically recognizes slavery, but changes it practically to an indenture of six years. The old law remains, but it is so modified as to receive an entirely different character. In the same way it is theoretically assumed (vers. 8-11) that the old law allowing a man to sell his daughter as a 'handmaid' remains in force, but it is practically abrogated by conditions that change its nature.

for 'tent of meeting', together with the frequent addition of the one phrase to the other is, therefore, an illustration of the way in which the old is carried over and combined with the new. It is impossible at this point to enter into further detached criticism of Eerdmans's position, but enough has been brought forward, I think, to make it clear that, while he has shown more satisfactorily than his predecessors how much in the Pentateuchal legislation is old, his main contention that the critical theory associated chiefly with the names of Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen,¹⁶⁵ must be set aside because based on erroneous assumptions, is not acceptable, partly because he has not carried the analysis of the Pentateuchal laws far enough, and, therefore, under-estimates their complicated character, and partly because he draws untenable conclusions from the material itself even as he has set it forth. The critical theory is of course subject to modification through further researches, but its basis rests on too firm foundations to be seriously menaced by the recent attacks made upon it.

¹⁶⁵ See Eerdmans's Introduction to *Alttestamentliche Forschungen*, I.